

THE

THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM,

A

Cumberland Presbyterian Quarterly.

REV. M. B. DeWITT, EDITOR.

—•••—
IN MEDIO TUTISSIMUS IDIE.
—•••—

Old Series, Vol. XIII.—New Series, Vol. VIII.

NO. I.—JANUARY, 1877.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION,

41 UNION STREET.

1877.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.* By J. BERRIEN LINDSLEY, M.D., D.D., Nashville, Tenn.	1
II. Universalism Examined and Refuted. By D. W. DORAN, Mattoon, Ill.	28
III. Theanthropos: The God-Man—No. I. By Rev. A. H. BERRY, Caverna, Ky.	73
IV. "Sanctification," "Holiness," "Perfect Peace. By J. B. LOGAN, D.D., Taylorville, Ill.	103
V. Preachers and Preaching. By JNO. MILLER McKEE, Nashville, Tenn.	115
VI. Conflicting Systems.	121



THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

JANUARY, 1877.

ART. I.—*Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.—No. VIII.*

THE SPIRITUAL FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH. 1797—1805.

THE manner in which I took hold of this work led me to plunge at once *in medias res*, and to bring before the reader's attention periodicals published 1830-1834. On the other hand, the very matter furnished by these periodicals compels me now to ascend the stream of time, and trace the rivulets and fountains whence flows the current of Cumberland Presbyterian history. Only by so doing can we comprehend satisfactorily the widening course of events. In the July number, 1876, a full description was given of the wonderful revival, when it had reached its culmination in central Kentucky. We will now study its feeble commencement and early progress. This can be best done in the description given by Rev. James Smith in Chaps. I., II., of "History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church." I prefer to copy his minute account, without abridgment, because of the intrinsic importance of the subject, and also because of the difference in dates, occurring in other authorities, while agreeing substantially as to fact. McGready's heirs placed his manuscripts in the hands of Smith when he was pastor at Henderson, Kentucky. Smith also had the papers of Hodge. Hence his account is really that of the principal personages

in the work, and should be decisive as to minute details. McGready, like very many Presbyterian ministers of that and the present day, made much use of his pen. His statements noted at the time are authentic, and must always outweigh those from memory or hearsay. Smith, page 559, *et seq.*, says:

"The Cumberland Presbyterian Church had its origin among the early settlers of the Green River country, in Kentucky, and the Cumberland country, in Tennessee. The early inhabitants of this beautiful and fertile region consisted of a heterogeneous mass, who, from the glowing descriptions that were given of the richness of its soil, and the salubrity of its climate, had flowed into it from all quarters of the Union, especially from Virginia and the Carolinas. Surrounded on all sides by a dense forest and a luxuriant country, the improvement and cultivation of which promised to place them in easy and affluent circumstances, it is not surprising that the great majority of the inhabitants bent all their energies to the promotion of their temporal interests, to the neglect of what was vastly more important, a preparation for eternity; especially when it is remembered that at that time, owing to their isolated condition, they were in a great measure deprived of the means of grace, which their descendants so abundantly enjoy. It is true, that at a very early period after the first settlement of the country, a few philanthropic and devoted missionaries immigrated into this new, extensive field of labor, where they underwent severe trials, submitted to disagreeable privations, and at the risk of falling victims to the Indian tomahawk and scalping knife, they traveled from settlement to settlement, proclaiming salvation through Christ Jesus to perishing sinners. Nor did they labor in vain, or spend their strength for naught; for they were often blessed with precious outpourings of God's Spirit, and through their instrumentality many souls were brought into the fold of Christ. But the number of such men was exceedingly small, when compared to the vast field before them, which was enlarging every year; and unfortunately, many who called themselves the ministers of the Gospel, removed into this country, who were in all things the reverse

of those mentioned above. Some were strangers to that change of heart without which all pretensions to be called and sent of God, to point perishing sinners to Jesus Christ, are but impious mockery; and others proved, by their conduct, that they possessed but little of the spirit of the gospel.

Like priest, like people, is a trite, but true saying; and in this region at that period, although here and there a true Nathaniel and a humble and devoted Mary were to be found, yet while many of the professed followers of Christ had a name to live, they were dead in trespasses and sins. These remarks are most especially applicable to the members of the Presbyterian Church, a fearful number of whom appear to have been strangers to true godliness. The Rev. Mr. David Rice, the first Presbyterian minister that settled in Kentucky, gives the following dark picture of many who possessed certificates of being in full communion in that Church: 'Some were grossly ignorant of the first principles of religion; some were given to quarrelling and fighting; some to profane swearing; some to intemperance.' Nor was this description of professed Christians confined to the region in which Mr. Rice resided; for in too many instances such members of the Church were to be found in the Green River and Cumberland countries, as the sequel will show. Indeed, at that period the Presbyterian Church in the West appears to have been in a wretched state of coldness and formality. 'The services of the sanctuary were long, unedifying, and irksome; and the communicants, with a very few exceptions, were confined to the heads of of families.'—*Dr. Cleland*. Such being the state of the Church, it is not surprising that the men of the world should treat the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ with neglect and contempt; and that society should be prone to infidelity, atheism, and every evil work.

Such was the darkly ominous state of the religious atmosphere of the then far West, when in addition to the few evangelical and devoted ministers (chiefly Methodists) already in the field, in the year, A. D. 1797, God, in his merciful providence, sent into this moral wilderness, that evangelical, holy, devoted, and powerful minister of the gospel, James McGuffee, whose memory will ever be dear, not only

to all who bear the Cumberland Presbyterian name, but to all sincere followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, who have a correct knowledge of his labors of love, and their blessed results.

In A. D. 1796, Mr. McGready determined to leave his congregation in Orange county, North Carolina, in consequence of a call from some of his former hearers, who had removed to Logan county, Kentucky. On his way to his new destination, he halted in the vicinity of Knoxville, East Tennessee, where he remained several months, preaching with power and energy, and was honored by the Head of the Church, by being instrumental in awakening and converting many precious souls, who will be his crown of rejoicing in the great day of Jesus Christ. When Mr. McGready arrived in Logan county, Kentucky, he became the pastor of three small congregations, viz.: Gasper River, Red River, and Muddy River societies; all of which were in a state of coldness and declension, and many of the members strangers to regeneration.

* * * Mr. McGready, who was a man of fervent piety, deep humility, and persevering in his supplications at a throne of grace, could not remain in a state of listlessness in this valley of the shadow of death, but determined in the strength of Israel's God, to arouse the people from their dangerous lethargy; and as immortal souls were every day sinking into perdition, he not only raised the alarm, but he also adopted and practised such measures as were most likely, under the blessing of God, to insure success, and result in a revival of religion, and the salvation of perishing sinners. He laid before the few living Christians of his charges, the desolations of Zion, the promises of their covenant God, and the efficacy of faithful, persevering, and effectual prayer. When their zeal for the cause of Christ was excited, and their love for the souls of their fellowmen was inflamed, he presented for their approval and signature, the following preamble and covenant:

'When we consider the word and promises of a compassionate God to the poor lost family of Adam, we find the strongest encouragement for Christians to pray in faith—to ask in the name of Jesus for the conversion of their fellow-

men. None ever went to Christ when on earth with the case of their friends, that were denied; and, although the days of his humiliation are ended, yet for the encouragement of his people, he has left it on record, that where two or three agree upon earth, to ask in prayer, *believing*, it shall be done. Again, *whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* With these promises before us, we feel encouraged to unite our supplications to a prayer-hearing God, for the outpouring of his Spirit, that his people may be quickened and comforted, and that children, and sinners generally, may be converted. Therefore, we bind ourselves to observe the third Saturday of each month, for one year, as a day of fasting and prayer, for the conversion of sinners in Logan county, and throughout the world. We also engage to spend one-half hour every Saturday evening, beginning at the setting of the sun, and one-half hour every Sabbath morning, at the rising of the sun, in pleading with God to revive his work.'

To this he and they affixed their names; having thus solemnly pledged themselves to God and each other, with a humble reliance upon the promises of Jehovah, both preacher and people betook themselves to fervent and persevering prayer. Mr. McGready, in his public exhibitions at this time, uniformly preached repentance, faith, and regeneration. A favorite subject with him was from Daniel v. 27, 'Tekel, thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting.' By the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit attending this discourse, many members of the Church became secretly convinced, that their hope was that of the hypocrite, which shall perish. At first, rage, and hatred of the preacher, took possession of their minds; but numbers were subsequently converted to God. In the meanwhile, Mr. McGready had unusual liberty in preaching the word, for God aided him, and answered the prayers of the faithful band, who were thus holding up his hands."

Upon carefully collating the next pages of Smith with the narrative preceding each edition of McGready's sermons, I find that they are made up by amplifying the latter, occasionally, with a polemic tone; and by some additional facts. I

prefer, therefore, to give my readers McGready's *ipsissima verba*, and then Smith's historical comments. This will always be an important original document in Western Church history.

"Narrative of the commencement and progress of the revival of 1800. By the late Rev. James McGready, in a letter to a friend, * * * dated,

LOGAN COUNTY, KY., Oct. 23, 1801.

'But I promised to give you a short statement of our blessed revival, on which you will at once say, the Lord has done great things for us in the wilderness, and the solitary place has been made glad: the desert has rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

In the month of May, 1797, which was the spring after I came to this country, the Lord graciously visited Gasper River congregation (an infant church then under my charge). The doctrines of regeneration, faith, and repentance, which I uniformly preached, seemed to call the attention of the people to a serious inquiry. During the winter the question was often proposed to me, Is religion a sensible thing? If I were converted would I feel it, and know it? In May, as I said before, the work began.

A woman, who had been a professor in full communion with the church, found her old hope false and delusive. She was struck with deep conviction, and in a few days was filled with joy and peace in believing. She immediately visited her friends and relatives, from house to house, and warned them of their danger in a most solemn, faithful manner, and plead with them to repent and seek religion. This, as a mean, was accompanied with the divine blessing to the awakening of many. About this time the ears of all in that congregation seemed to be open to receive the word preached, and almost every sermon was accompanied with the power of God, to the awakening of sinners. During the summer about ten persons in the congregation were brought to Christ. In the fall of the year, a general deadness seemed to creep on apace. Conviction and conversion work, in a great measure, ceased; and no visible alteration for the better took place, until the summer of 1798, at the administration of the

sacrament of the supper, which was in July. On Monday the Lord graciously poured out his Spirit; a very general awakening took place; perhaps but few families in the congregation could be found who, less or more, were not struck with an awful sense of their lost estate. During the week following but few persons attended to worldly business, their attention to the business of their souls was so great. On the first Sabbath of September, the sacrament was administered at Muddy River (one of my congregations). At this meeting the Lord graciously poured forth his Spirit, to the awakening of many careless sinners. Through these two congregations already mentioned, and through Red River, my other congregation, awakening work went on with power under every sermon. The people seemed to hear, as for eternity. In every house, and almost in every company, the whole conversation with people, was about the state of their souls. About this time the Rev. J. B. came here, and found a Mr. R. to join him. In a little time he involved our infant churches in confusion, disputation, etc., opposed the doctrines preached here; ridiculed the whole work of revival; formed a considerable party, etc., etc. In a few weeks this seemed to have put a final stop to the whole work, and our infant congregations remained in a state of deadness and darkness from the fall, through the winter, and until the month of July, 1799, at the administration of the sacrament at Red River. This was a very solemn time throughout. On Monday the power of God seemed to fill the congregation; the boldest, daring sinners in the country covered their faces, and wept bitterly. After the congregation was dismissed, a large number of people stayed about the doors, unwilling to go away. Some of the ministers proposed to me to collect the people in the meeting-house again, and perform prayer with them; accordingly we went in, and joined in prayer and exhortation. The mighty power of God came amongst us like a shower from the everlasting hills. God's people were quickened and comforted; yea, some of them were filled with joy unspeakable, and full of glory. Sinners were powerfully alarmed, and some precious souls were brought to feel the pardoning love of Jesus.

At Gasper River (at this time under the care of Mr. Rankin, a precious instrument in the hand of God), the sacrament was administered in August. This was one of the days of the Son of Man, indeed, especially on Monday. I preached a plain gospel sermon, Heb. xi. 16.,—the “better country.” A great solemnity continued during the sermon. After sermon, Mr. Rankin gave a solemn exhortation; the congregation was then dismissed; but the people all kept their seats for a considerable space, whilst awful solemnity appeared in the countenances of a large majority. Presently several persons under deep conviction broke forth in a loud outcry; many fell to the ground, lay powerless, groaning, praying and crying for mercy. As I passed through the multitude, a woman, lying in awful distress, called me to her. Said she: “I lived in your congregation in Carolina. I was a professor, and often went to the communion; but I was deceived; I have no religion; I am going to hell.” In another place an old, gray-headed man lay in an agony of distress, addressing his weeping wife and children in such language as this: “We are all going to hell together; we have lived prayerless, ungodly lives; the work of our souls is yet to begin; we must get religion, or we will all be damned.” But time would fail me to mention every instance of this kind.

At Muddy River the sacrament was administered in September. The power of God was gloriously present on this occasion. The circumstances of it are equal, if not superior to those of Gasper River. Many souls were solemnly awakened; a number, we hope, converted; whilst the people of God feasted on the hidden manna, and, with propriety, might be said to sing the new song. But the year 1800 exceeds all that my eyes ever beheld upon earth. All that I have related is only, as it were, an introduction. Although many souls in these congregations, during the three preceding years, have been savingly converted, and now give living evidences of their union to Christ; yet all that work is only like a few drops before a mighty rain, when compared with the wonders of Almighty Grace, that took place in the year 1800.

In June the sacrament was administered at Red River. This was the greatest time we had ever seen before. On Monday multitudes were struck down under awful conviction; the cries of the distressed filled the whole house. There you might see profane swearers, and Sabbath breakers pricked to the heart, and crying out, "What shall we do to be saved?" There frolickers and dancers were crying for mercy. There you might see little children of ten, eleven, and twelve years of age, praying and crying for redemption in the blood of Jesus, in agonies of distress. During this sacrament, and until the Tuesday following, ten persons, we believe, were savingly brought home to Christ.

In July the sacrament was administered in Gasper River congregation. Here multitudes crowded from all parts of the country to see a strange work, from the distance of forty, fifty, and even a hundred miles; while families came in their wagons; between twenty and thirty wagons were brought to the place, loaded with people, and their provisions, in order to camp at the meeting-house. On Friday, nothing more appeared during the day than a decent solemnity. On Saturday, matters continued in the same way until the evening. Two pious women were sitting together, conversing about the exercises; which conversation seemed to affect some of the by-standers; instantly the divine flame spread through the whole multitude. Presently you might have seen sinners lying powerless in every part of the house, praying and crying for mercy. Ministers and private Christians were kept busy during the night conversing with the distressed. This night a goodly number of awakened souls were delivered by sweet believing views of the glory, fullness, and sufficiency of Christ, to save to the uttermost. Amongst these were some little children—a striking proof of the religion of Jesus. Of many instances to which I have been an eye-witness, I shall only mention one, viz.: a little girl. I stood by her whilst she lay across her mother's lap almost in despair. I was conversing with her when the first gleam of light broke in upon her mind. She started to her feet, and, in an ecstasy of joy, she cried out, "O he is willing! he is willing!—he is come! he is come! O what a sweet Christ he is! O what a

fullness I see in him! O what a beauty I see in him! O why was it that I never could believe! that I never could come to Christ before, when Christ was so willing to save me?" Then turning round, she addressed sinners, and told them of the glory, willingness, and preciousness of Christ, and plead with them to repent; and all this in language so heavenly, and, at the same time, in language so rational and scriptural, that I was filled with astonishment. But, were I to write you every particular of this kind that I have been an eye and an ear-witness to during the past two years, it would fill many sheets of paper.

At this sacrament a great many people from Cumberland, particularly from Shiloh congregation, came with great curiosity to see the work, yet prepossessed with strong prejudices against it; about five of whom, I trust, were savingly and powerfully converted before they left the place. A circumstance worthy of observation; they were sober professors in full communion. It was truly affecting to see them lying powerless, crying for mercy, and speaking to their friends and relatives in such language as this: "O we despised the work that we heard of in *Logan*; but O we were deceived—I have no religion; I know now there is a reality in these things: three days ago I would have despised any person that would have behaved as I am doing now; but O I feel the very pains of hell in my soul!" This was the language of a precious soul, just before the hour of deliverance came. When they went home, their conversation to their friends and neighbors, was the means of commencing a glorious work that has overspread all the Cumberland settlements, to the conversion of hundreds of precious souls. The work continued night and day at this sacrament, whilst the vast multitude continued upon the ground until Tuesday morning. According to the best computation, we believe that forty-five souls were brought to Christ on this occasion.

Muddy River sacrament, in all its circumstances, was equal, and in some respects superior, to that of Gasper River. This sacrament was in August. We believe about fifty persons obtained religion.

At Ridge sacrament, in Cumberland, the second Sabbath

in September, about forty-five souls, we believe, obtained religion; at Shiloh sacrament, the third Sabbath in September, about seventy persons; at Mr. Craighead's sacrament, in October, about forty persons; at the Clay Lick sacrament, *congregation* in Logan county, in October, eight persons; at Little Muddy Creek sacrament, in November, about twelve; at Montgomery's meeting-house, in Cumberland, in November, about forty; at Hopewell sacrament, in Cumberland, in November, about twenty persons. To mention the circumstances of more private occasions, common-days' preaching, and societies, would swell a letter to a volume.

The present year has been a blessed season likewise, yet not equal to last year in conversion work. I shall just give you a list of our sacraments, and the number, we believe, experienced religion at each, during the present year, 1801.' My correspondent here mentions several different sacraments held at different places, and the number he hopes obtained religion at these several solemnities amounts in all to one hundred and forty-four persons. He then proceeds:

'I would just remark that, among the great numbers in our country that professed to obtain religion, I scarcely know an instance of any that gave a comfortable ground of hope to the people of God, that they had religion, and have been admitted to the privileges of the Church, that have, in any degree, disgraced their profession or given us any ground to doubt their religion.

Were I to mention to you the rapid progress of this work in vacant congregations, carried on by means of a few supplies, and by praying societies—such as at Stone's River, Cedar Creek, Goose Creek, the Red Banks, the Fountain Head, and many other places—it would be more than time or the bounds of a letter would admit of. Mr. McG. and myself administered the sacrament at the Red Banks, on the Ohio, about a month ago—a vacant congregation, nearly a hundred miles distant from any regularly organized society, formerly a place famed for wickedness, and a perfect synagogue of Satan. I visited them twice at an early period, Mr. R. twice, and Mr. H. once. These supplies the Lord blessed as a means to start his work; and their praying societies were

attended with the power of God, to the conversion of almost whole families. When we administered the sacrament amongst them, they appeared to be the most blessed little society I ever saw. I ordained ten elders among them, all precious Christians; three of which, two years ago, were professed deists, now living monuments of Almighty Grace.”

The original is signed by James McGready.

Smith observes: “The first camp-meeting in Christendom was held in July, 1800, at the Gasper River church. It is worthy of remark, that the gracious work first commenced in this church, and although the other two congregations had been blessed with times of awakening and refreshing, yet the effect of them had been, in a great measure, confined to their immediate vicinities; but from this congregation, and from the first camp-meeting, the revival spirit went forth, which diffused itself throughout the churches of the West, and resulted in the conversion of thousands of immortal souls, and caused its influence to be felt not only in the Valley of the Mississippi, but also on the coast of the Atlantic, particularly in the Carolinas.

The influence of camp-meetings on the inhabitants of the western country has been immense; thousands, and tens of thousands, on these occasions have professed to pass from death unto life. Meetings of this nature are now (1835) held in almost all parts of the United States, and by different denominations. They have been for years held by a certain class of Methodists in England; and an attempt has been made to introduce them into Scotland, and in the vicinity of Edinburgh, its capital. But very few are acquainted with their origin, which has been traced to various causes, by curious speculators on the subject. Although it is true that the Jews, on many occasions, held such convocations, and multitudes assembled in the wilderness, where they remained for days, hearing the heavenly discourses of Him who spake as never man spake; yet, in these latter days, such meetings were not in use until they were introduced by Mr. McGready.

A person whose veracity and piety are unquestioned, and who resided in the vicinity of Gasper River congregation when the revival first appeared there, some years ago gave us

the following relation concerning the origin of the first camp-meeting (the late Captain Estill, of Winchester, Tennessee): 'A family, consisting of a father and his seven daughters, had removed from one of the Carolinas to Logan county. Shortly after their arrival they were informed of the *strange* work that had appeared in Mr. McGready's congregation, and that a sacramental meeting was about to be held at Gasper River church. They felt solicitous to be present, but as they resided at some distance from the place of meeting, and were strangers in the country, they felt unwilling to impose themselves on the hospitality of those who were unacquainted with them, and were about to abandon the thought of being present, when one of them said they had often encamped by their wagon in the open air while upon their journey, without sustaining any injury, and that to pursue the same course on the present occasion would subject them to no great inconvenience. The family went to the meeting in their wagon, provided with provisions for themselves and horses, and encamped near the church. By the close of the exercises, most of them had professed to obtain an interest in the blood of the atonement. This happy family returned home rejoicing in the Lord, and in the fullness of their hearts, declared to their neighbors the great things God had done for them. The curiosity of many became excited, and some were awakened to a sense of their danger; and, hearing of another meeting (we think at Muddy River church), two or three families went to it in their wagons, and most of the converts on this occasion were from this company. Mr. McGready observed the circumstance, believed it a token that God would bless such conduct, and urged upon the members of his congregations to request their friends at a distance to come to the meetings prepared to remain on the ground. Previous to the meeting at Gasper River, in July, he had it proclaimed far and wide, that on that occasion he expected the people to encamp on the ground, and sent pressing invitations to ministers at a distance to come and see this strange work, and to induce as many of their people as possible to be present.' Whatever objections may be urged against camp-meetings in the vicinity of large cities, and in

densely populated countries, certainly the course pursued by Mr. McGready on that occasion, was admirably calculated to promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom among the early settlers of this western wilderness. At that period the country was but thinly inhabited; the settlements were comparatively few and at a distance from each other. Indeed, the blessed results of that meeting, and hundreds that have followed it, clearly prove that in this affair Mr. McGready had the approbation of Heaven. But to return.

The intelligence that a strange work was in progress in Logan county, had excited the curiosity of multitudes in the adjacent counties, and being encouraged by the invitations of Mr. McGready, a vast concourse of people flocked to the meeting from a distance of twenty, thirty, fifty, and even a hundred miles. In many instances, whole families went in their wagons, with provisions, etc. At this meeting, and indeed at all of the same nature for years afterwards, no cabins were erected for the accommodation of the people, as is now universally done at the camp-meetings in this country. But the people sheltered themselves the best way they could; some slept in their wagons, others erected temporary tents covered with bed-clothes, etc. Their fare was of the most frugal kind, simply consisting of what was necessary to sustain nature. As the wagons arrived, they took their stations so as to form a large square, near the center of which a temporary pulpit or stand was erected, formed of rough logs, with a small hand-board for the convenience of the preachers. As many as possible of the assembled multitudes were accommodated on seats formed by placing on the ground long logs, parallel, but at some distance, and above these, others roughly hewn, crosswise. The ministers who occupied the pulpit on that occasion were James McGready, William McGee, and William Hodge, with perhaps others of whom we have no certain knowledge."

Smith gives a somewhat fuller account than "The Narrative" of the meetings at the Ridge, at Shiloh, at Mr. Craighead's sacrament, and at Montgomery's, or the Beech.

When it is remembered that in 1800, Kentucky had a population of only one hundred and five thousand six hundred and

two souls, and Tennessee, of two hundred and twenty thousand nine hundred and sixty, and that these two States were the *foci* both of the Northwest and Southwest, receiving and distributing for many subsequent years, a vast tide of migration, it is difficult to over-estimate the influence of the great religious movement which goes by the name of the first year of the century. While many good and powerful men from different quarters and churches aided in this remarkable work, I do not see how there can be any doubt as to where THE FIRE first broke out. Yet, on referring to standard authorities, I find McGready almost ignored, or else his name introduced so that the reader would suppose him to have been an enemy of the work. Redford's *Methodism in Kentucky*, vol. I., pp. 265, 367, is an instance of the first description; Bangs, vol. II., page 102, of the latter. McFerrin, all his life thoroughly conversant with the Cumberland country, is quite aware of the claims of the Presbyterians on this point, but still he is disposed to think that they are too high. He and all the Methodist historians place great stress upon, and either copy or draw largely from the account given by John McGee. Yet, it is evident that the latter only took part in the *beginning* of this work, as a visitor, along with his brother, to one of McGready's churches, where the revival had long been germinating. I will copy from Redford, vol. I., pp. 267, 272, McGee's letter, dated June 23, 1820, to the Rev. Thomas L. Douglass, at that time presiding elder of the Nashville district. It was first printed in the *Methodist Magazine*, vol. IV. The reader will thus have all the data necessary to form his own opinion—the minutes of the Presbyterian pastor and the recollections of the Methodist local preacher.

“DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I have endeavored to recollect some of the most noted circumstances which occurred at the commencement of the work of God in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee, and which came under my observation in 1799 and the two following years.

I suppose I am one of the two brothers referred to in Theophilus Arminius' account of the work of God in the western country. My brother, William McGee, is fallen

asleep in the bosom of his beloved Master. We were much attached to each other from our infancy, but much more so when we both experienced the uniting love of Jesus Christ. I was the elder, and by the mercy and grace of God, sought and experienced religion first. With great anxiety of mind, he heard me preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, before he felt or enjoyed peace with God. After he obtained religion, he thought proper to receive holy orders in the Presbyterian Church; and, after preaching some time in North Carolina and in the Holston country, he came to Cumberland (now West Tennessee), about the year 1796 or 1797, and settled in a congregation in Sumner county, about the year 1798. Several reasons induced me to remove with my family from North Carolina to the western country, and, in the year 1798, settled in Sumner (now Smith) county. The difference of doctrines professed by the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, was not sufficient to dissolve those ties of love and affection which we both felt. We loved, and prayed, and preached together; and God was pleased to own and bless us and our labors. In the year 1799, we agreed to make a tour through the Barrens, toward Ohio, and concluded to attend a sacramental solemnity in the Rev. Mr. McGready's congregation, on Red River, in our way. When we came there, I was introduced by my brother, and received an invitation to address the congregation from the pulpit, and I know not that ever God favored me with more light and liberty than he did each day, while I endeavored to convince the people that they were sinners, and urged the necessity of repentance, and of a change from nature to grace; and held up to their view the greatness, freeness, and fullness of salvation, which was in Christ Jesus, for lost, guilty, condemned sinners. My brother and the Rev. Mr. Hodge preached with much animation and liberty. The people felt the force of truth, and tears ran down their cheeks, but all was silent until Monday, the last day of the feast. Mr. Hodge gave a useful discourse; an intermission was given and I was appointed to preach. While Mr. Hodge was preaching, a woman in the east end of the house got an uncommon blessing, broke through order, and shouted for some time, and then

sat down in silence. At the close of the sermon, Messrs. Hodge, McGready, and Rankin went out of the house; my brother and myself sat still; the people seemed to have no disposition to leave their seats. My brother felt such a power to come on him, that he quit his seat and sat down on the floor of the pulpit (I suppose not knowing what he did). A power which caused me to tremble was upon me. There was a solemn weeping all over the house. Having a wish to preach, I strove against my feelings; at length I rose up and told the people I was appointed to preach, but there was a greater than I preaching, and exhorted them to let the Lord God omnipotent reign in their hearts, and to submit to him, and their souls should live. Many broke silence; the woman in the east end shouted tremendously. I left the pulpit to go to her, and as I went along through the people, it was suggested to me, 'You know these people are much for order; they will not bear this confusion; go back and be quiet.' I turned to go back, and was near falling. The power of God was strong upon me; I turned again, and, losing sight of the fear of man, I went through the house, shouting and exhorting with all possible ecstasy and energy, and the floor was soon covered with the slain; their screams for mercy pierced the heavens, and mercy came down. Some found forgiveness, and many went away from that meeting feeling unutterable agonies of soul for redemption in the blood of Jesus. This was the beginning of that glorious revival of religion in this country, which was so great a blessing to thousands: and from this meeting camp-meetings took their rise. One man, for want of horses for all his family to ride and attend the meeting, fixed up his wagon, in which he took them and his provisions, and lived on the ground throughout the meeting. He had left his worldly cares behind him, and had nothing to do but attend on Divine service.

The next popular meeting was on Muddy River, and this was a camp-meeting. A number of wagons loaded with people came together and camped on the ground; and the Lord was present and approved of their zeal by sending a pardon to about forty souls. The next camp-meeting was on

the Ridge, where there was an increase of people, and carriages of different descriptions, and a great many preachers of the Presbyterian and Methodist orders, and some of the Baptist, but the latter were generally opposed to the work. Preaching commenced, and the people prayed, and the power of God attended. There was a great cry for mercy. The nights were truly awful; the camp-ground was well illumined; the people were differently exercised all over the ground—some exhorting, some shouting, some praying, and some crying for mercy, while others lay as dead men on the ground. Some of the spiritually wounded fled to the woods, and their groans could be heard all through the surrounding groves, as the groans of dying men. From thence many came into the camp, rejoicing and praising God for having found redemption in the blood of the Lamb. At this meeting it was computed that one hundred souls were converted from nature to grace. But perhaps the greatest meeting we ever witnessed in this country, took place shortly after on Desha's Creek, near Cumberland River. Many thousands of people attended. The mighty power and mercy of God were manifested. The people fell before the word, like corn before a storm of wind, and many rose from the dust with divine glory shining in their countenances, and gave glory to God in such strains as made the hearts of stubborn sinners to tremble; and after the first gust of praise, they would break forth in volleys of exhortation. Amongst these were many small home-bred boys, who spoke with the tongue, wisdom, and eloquence of the learned; and truly they were learned, for they were all taught of God, who had taken their feet out of the mire and clay, and put a new song in their mouths. Although there were converts of different ages under this work, it was remarkable they were generally the children of praying parents. Here John A. Granade, the western poet, who composed the *Pilgrim's Songs*—after being many months in almost entire desperation, till he was worn down and appeared like a walking skeleton—found pardon and mercy from God, and began to preach a risen Jesus. Some of the Pharisees cried *disorder* and *confusion*, but in disorderly assemblies there are generally dislocated and bro-

ken bones and bruised flesh, but here, the women laid their sleeping children at the roots of the trees, while hundreds of all ages and colors were stretched on the ground in the agonies of conviction, and as dead men; while thousands, day and night, were crowding round them, and passing to and fro, yet there was nobody hurt, which shows that the people were perfectly in their senses; and on this chaos of apparent confusion, God said, Let there be light, and there was light! and many emerged out of darkness into it. We have hardly ever had a camp-meeting since, without his presence and power to convert souls. Glory to God and the Lamb forever and ever!

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN MCGEE."

Dr. Redford adds: "The revivals that thus began, under the labors of these two brothers, soon spread over the entire of Southern Kentucky and what is now known as Middle Tennessee. Their sacred influence was carried to every community, and into almost every home. The Church was inspired with a new zeal, and the truth was preached with an energy and pathos that impressed it on the hearts of the people." On page 135 he says: "If this remarkable revival of religion did not owe its origin to the instrumentality of John Page, it certainly was promoted and extended through his pious labors and exertions."

Dr. McFerrin—*Methodism in Tennessee*, vol. I., p. 339—says: "The manner in which this great revival began was remarkable. There seems to have been no particular or special effort on the part of the Church or the ministry for a revival. True, the preachers were faithful, self-denying, and zealous in the cause of Christ. They went forth praying sinners to be reconciled to God; but there was no one great revival preacher like George Whitefield, sweeping like a comet through the heavens; there were no protracted meetings at which, by long and united effort, a revival was the result, but a strange and unusual power came upon the preachers and upon the people in the use of the ordinary means of grace."

Let the reader compare McGready's Narrative with McGee's letter, and it will be evident that the meetings at-

tended by the latter, as he *recollected*, in 1799, were really those of 1800. This was the *third* year of prayer, preparation, expectation, and foretaste. Long and special scriptural effort had been made. In this connection, certain ecclesiastical data will be of interest and significance. In Kentucky, the Baptists, from the first settlement, had been the largest and most influential denomination. See Redford, vol. I., p. 289. Next, beyond question, were the Presbyterians. In Tennessee, the Presbyterians preponderated at the start; next came the Baptists. In each of these States, at this period, the Methodists were really not numerous in membership or ministers. Their admirable pioneer itinerant system made each preacher a host in himself, and led to rapid increase in numbers and influence. But just now we are looking at A. D. 1800. The Rev. D. R. McAnally, in his "Life and Times of Samuel Patton," quoted by McFerrin, and also by Redford, vol. I., p. 250, says: "The settlements in Kentucky were rapidly enlarging and being filled up, and all the western preachers that could be spared were taken for that work, so that only three were left for all the Holston country. New River, Holston, and Russell circuits were united, under the care of John Watson and John Page, while James Hunter was sent to Green. One preacher only (William Lambeth) was all that could be, or that was afforded to the Cumberland or West Tennessee country, while there were seven in Kentucky."

In 1800, the membership in the Methodist Church in Kentucky was, including whites and colored, one thousand seven hundred and forty-one. (Redford, vol. I., p. 249.) In Tennessee, it was six hundred and eighty-one white and sixty-two colored; of these, in Cumberland, two hundred and forty-seven white and forty colored. (McFerrin, vol. I., p. 335.) I have not been able to get the exact membership of the Presbyterian Church at this date, but from secular as well as ecclesiastical writers, it is evident that for numbers as well as influence, it was the leading denomination in the West. Benedict, the accurate historian of the Baptist Church, who, in person, explored all this region in 1809, mentions the fact that in 1788, the Presbyterians in Tennessee had twenty-

three large congregations, while there were but ten Baptist churches in the country, and most of these very small.

The more minutely the facts connected with the commencement of the great awakening are analyzed, the more prominent does the idea become "that the revival originated with the Presbyterians, and was carried forward by the Presbyterians; that, in the Presbyterian Church, there were two parties, the revival party and the anti-revivalists; and that in the final issue, the revival party went into the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and those opposed to the revival, remained with the Presbyterians."* We are now studying, it must be remembered, not the revival as it was continued in 1801 and afterwards in Kentucky, but as it began in the Green river and Cumberland countries in 1800 and previously. If "several writers, who profess to be very particular and minute in the details, have almost entirely ignored the Methodist element,"* they have made a blunder, for, from the first, it is evident that from McGee to McKendree and Asbury, they promoted it and made it redound greatly to the advancement of their own beloved Church, as was right, and entirely consonant with their doctrines and customs.

At the beginning, and during the first years of the noted work, the Presbyterians and Methodists labored together with great harmony and consequent efficiency. Lewis Garrett (McFerrin, vol. I., pp. 169, 170), in his "Recollections of the West," says, "The revival which commenced among the Methodists and Presbyterians in the year 1800, had spread all over this country (Middle Tennessee and Southern Kentucky); for each had at this time traveling preachers carrying the news of heavenly grace to almost every neighborhood. Many yet remember the zealous and useful labors of Anderson, the amiable and powerful Presbyterian traveling preacher, who fell in the field of labor, and soon went to reap an eternal reward. Here Page, Wilkerson, John and William McGee, McGready, Hodge, Gwin, etc., etc., had gone

* McFerrin, vol. I., p. 345, says: "Nothing could be further from the truth."

forth weeping, bearing precious seed: here camp-meetings were held in their original, simple, artless style; no ostentatious show; no fine tables spread with dainties, or loaded with luxuries—a simple repast to satisfy the cravings of nature, and then preaching a plain, unsophisticated gospel; prayer and songs of praise were the delightful employments. The woods resounded with the shouts of the converted, and the responding hallelujahs of the happy.”

“It was then difficult to discriminate between a Presbyterian and a Methodist preacher, or member; they preached together, and shouted together; for stiff, sullen, dry formality was not then much in vogue. The gospel preached was the power of God to salvation; and the religion which was experienced warmed and animated, and kindled into rapture. Its possessors felt it, ‘pressed down, shaken together, and running over.’” On page 355, Garrett says, that the revival “took effect with different denominations of Christians, but the Methodists and Presbyterians shared most largely in its fruits.”

From Redford, vol. I, p. 360, we learn that the name “General Camp-meetings” was used, because Presbyterians and Methodists united in them. On pages 334, 335, is the following interesting evidence of this co-operation: “On the 16th of October (1801), he (Bishop Asbury) enters the State of Tennessee, and the 18th he preached at Parker’s, where he was met by ‘Brothers McGee, Sugg, Jones, and Speer, local preachers,’ and ‘had a small shout in the camp of Israel.’ On the 19th he looked upon Nashville for the first time, and met a congregation of ‘not less than one thousand in and out of the stone church,’ to whom sermons were preached by Mr. McKendree, Bishop Whatcoat, and himself, the services lasting three hours.’ On the following day we find him at Drake’s Creek meeting-house, at the close of a sacramental solemnity that had been held four days by Craighead, Hodge, Rankin, McGee, and Adair, Presbyterian ministers, at which sermons were preached by McKendree, Whatcoat, and himself. On that day and night following, he enjoyed the privilege of mingling ‘with scenes of deepest interest.’ The great revival to which we have so frequently referred, was

now in its zenith in Tennessee and Southern Kentucky. The vast assemblies that attended the preaching of the gospel could not be accommodated in any of the churches. At this meeting 'the stand was in the open air, embosomed in a wood of lofty beech-trees.' We copy from Asbury's Journal, vol. II., pp. 476, 477.

'Tuesday, October 21. Yesterday, and especially during the night, were witnessed scenes of deep interest. In the intervals between preaching, the people refreshed themselves and horses, and returned upon the ground. The stand was in the open air, embosomed in a wood of lofty beech-trees. The ministers of God, Methodists and Presbyterians, united their labors, and mingled, with the child-like simplicity of primitive times. Fires blazing here and there, dispelled the darkness, and the shouts of the redeemed captives, and the cries of precious souls struggling into life, broke the silence of midnight. The weather was delightful: as if heaven smiled, whilst mercy flowed in abundant streams of salvation to perishing sinners. We suppose there were at least thirty souls converted at this meeting. I rejoice that God is visiting the sons of the Puritans, who are candid enough to acknowledge their obligations to the Methodists.'

How closely the two denominations affiliated during these revival times appears from this record by the Rev. Leroy H. Cage (McFerrin, vol. II., p. 201): "Shortly after my grandfather, William Dillard, removed and settled in what is now Jackson county, the Methodists and Cumberland Presbyterians formed circuits, and William Dillard acted as an official member for each Church. They all preached in the same house; on the same book he registered the name of the members, and opposite each he put 'M' for Methodist, and 'P' for Presbyterian. When he called for money to support the ministers, each contributed to their pastor."

After a while this Christian state of things was interfered with by sectarian feelings. I do not find much light upon the how and why. The Rev. Jacob Young, D.D., was a very prominent preacher in the Methodist Church. He left an autobiography. Every one is aware with what diffidence autobiographies, unless written as current diaries, are to be

received as historical evidence. The following statements by Dr. Young are, however, doubtless correct, as from his point of view. He was on the Nashville circuit in 1806, William McKendree, Presiding Elder. He says (McFerrin, vol. II., p. 76): "I found the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches were closely united. They had taken many of our efficient class-leaders, and made them elders in their Church, and their elders had been made class-leaders in the Methodist Church. I could not tell who were Methodists, and who Presbyterians. When I would close my sermon and dismiss the congregation very few would leave."

Page 78: "Before the Cumberlands withdrew from the Presbyterians, they began to show a little jealousy toward the Methodists; they thought the Methodists were receiving more than their share, and accused some of our people and preachers of breaking the terms of the union. But we moved on in harmony on Nashville circuit. I was exceedingly cautious to keep within the limits of the union, as they called it. I had wise counselors, such as Green Hill, John McGee, John Page, Lewis Garrett, and as they were scattered all around the circuit, I could find a counselor in every neighborhood. But in the adjoining circuit there was a great deal of complaining. A preacher of great popularity was sent on to what was called Roaring River circuit, by the name of Miles Harper. He went on preaching and exercising discipline, as a Methodist preacher. They called upon him, and told him he was violating the terms of the union. He said: 'He knew nothing about the terms of the union; they had no power to make rules to govern him—he was governed by the Bible and Methodist Discipline.' One article of the union was, 'We were not to preach on controverted points.' Another, 'We were not to proselyte.' Harper paid no attention to their complaints, but went on preaching what he thought was gospel, and admitting all into the Church who made application."

Pages 83, 84, 85. "He (McKendree) went on from my circuit to Brother Harper's. The Presbyterians still complained of Harper's breaking the terms of union. McKendree called a committee, and put Harper on his trial. When put to the

test, they could not prove the charges. Harper defended himself in a very masterly manner, and showed, in a satisfactory way, that the Presbyterian brethren were guilty of the very things they were charging against him. They had become loud and clamorous on the doctrine of the unconditional and final perseverance of the saints. This, they all knew, was a controverted point. Harper was acquitted, and came off triumphant. McKendree then attended a joint camp-meeting at Fountain Head. There he gave them the result of Harper's trial. The Presbyterians appeared satisfied, and reconciled with Harper, and wished to go on and perpetuate the union. McKendree raised a slight objection, which startled them. One of them said: 'O brother McKendree, we are satisfied now.' McKendree replied: 'But I am not satisfied with you, my brethren,' and took out a list of charges against several of their preachers, read it, and demanded satisfaction. They appeared much confused, and retired to hold a council. They soon returned a grave answer, saying: 'There is no rule in our Discipline by which you can bring a minister to trial for such a charge.' McKendree's reply was worthy of himself: 'First you preferred charges against one of our respectable preachers, not for violating any rule in our Discipline, but for transgressing some of the articles of our union. I put him on his trial, and he was acquitted. Now, I demand the same thing of you.' They appeared confounded, and did not know what to say, but gave him to understand that they could not receive his charges.

He then told them that the Christian union, so much talked of, was not what it had been represented to him; that it was a mere farcical thing; and, after much Christian conversation, all concluded in a Christian spirit. The council adjourned, and every man went to his own home.

McKendree now saw the necessity of having the Christian union better defined, that it might be more fully understood; that the privileges and duties flowing from this fountain of love, as it was called, might be reciprocal, and that the parties might stand on equal ground. In order to carry out this grand design, he wrote a large circular, in which he

gave a full exposition of this Christian union, illustrating every part, so that even children might understand, and sent a copy to every preacher within the bounds of his district, with instructions to read it in every congregation. I read it faithfully in every congregation on Nashville circuit.

There was a good deal of squirming. Men would often come to me to get the document, and, after reading it, return it. I felt that the union was about to pass away."

In Bishop Paine's life of McKendree, vol. II., pp. 343-354, there is a minute "Account of the Union of the Presbyterians and Methodists in 1805," by McKendree himself. It harmonizes with Dr. Young's version, as above given, of the origin and termination of one of the earliest attempts toward Christian union in America.

A close scrutiny into the ecclesiastical history of that period will prevent us from being surprised that such a leader as McKendree should, under the circumstances above described by Dr. Young, be disposed to draw Church lines rather sharply. It will also show us that from the very conception of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, it was destined to encounter from the growing and popular Methodist Church, an opposition, if anything, more watchful and jealous than that of the old, learned, and powerful Presbyterian Church. There certainly must have been great elements of vitality with the new people, to have enabled them successfully to confront such varied and strong obstacles. It is also worthy of note that McKendree's steps were taken just after the decisive action of the Synodical Commission, and about four years before the permanent organization of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, while its future members and ministers were in great doubt and perplexity as to what would be the issue from all these troubles.

Our limits permit only a few citations confirming the above. Redford, vol. I., pp. 253, 254, gives a synopsis of a great defection which had taken place not long previously, and was of just such a character as to put a prudent leader on his guard against a new people, combining the fervor of Methodism with the republicanism of Presbyterianism. "Another cause of the decrease in membership during this

period (1792-1800), is to be found in the influence exerted by Mr. O'Kelly. While the injurious effects of the steps that he had so unfortunately taken, for awhile arrested the prosperity of the Church in Virginia and North Carolina, the evil that he wrought was not confined to these sections, in which he had previously attained such popularity as an evangelist: its pernicious results reached the farthest limits of the Church in America, immediately following his secession. For several years a decrease in the aggregate membership is reported in the General Minutes. In 1795, when his power was at its height, and he was spreading desolation throughout the Church, the decrease reached *six thousand three hundred and seventeen*, which was more than one-tenth the entire membership of the Church. Kentucky had chiefly been settled by emigrants from Virginia, and the infant Church in the West became involved in the controversy. Some of the prominent preachers were beguiled by its teachings. We have already seen James Haw, one of the first two missionaries, embracing the views of Mr. O'Kelly, and carrying with him almost the entire corps of preachers, and many of the members in the Cumberland circuit, which lay partly in Kentucky. The infection reached the central and northern portions of the State, and threw many of the societies into confusion and strife."

Of James Haw, who was received into the first Cumberland Presbytery from the Republican Methodist Church, a full sketch will be given further on. His peculiar course would tend to render Methodist rulers guarded and watchful against Cumberland Presbyterians.

One of the first Methodist missionaries sent to Kentucky was Benjamin Ogden. In 1787 he was appointed to visit and labor in what was then called Cumberland. McFerrin, vol. I., page 44. At one period, Mr. Ogden withdrew from the Church; and after continuing several years not regularly connected with any religious community, rejoined it. He was the father of John Wesley Ogden, the well-known Cumberland Presbyterian minister. Redford, vol. I., pp. 96, 97.

ART. II.—*Universalism Examined and Refuted.*

THE proposition which I shall endeavor to disprove is this: *All the human family will ultimately become holy and happy.* This may be refuted in two ways equally legitimate, both of which will be employed in this discussion. 1. By directly showing the proposition to be untrue; that is, by adducing contradictory evidence. 2. By establishing the truth of the contradictory proposition, viz.: *Some of the human family will not become holy and happy.* As in mathematics, so also in theology, the latter method is often found to be the more convenient.

While preparing this discussion, I shall console myself with the reflection that even if I should be in error, and Universalism should be true, no human soul will ever miss heaven on account of what I have written, and in that promiscuous resurrection of the just and the unjust, I will receive a crown as unfading as though I had never opposed the doctrine of universal salvation, as taught in the Scriptures. The danger is with the other party. It must be quite evident to every intelligent observer, that orthodox Christians live about as happily here below as Universalists. The shouting Methodist often obtains enrapturing visions of his "home over there," which, notwithstanding the weakness of the flesh and the danger of apostasy, he hopes ere-long to reach. The demure Presbyterian finds in the pealing anthem, the majestic psalm, or the preaching of the word, a grandeur and sublimity which lifts him far above the groveling things of earth-life into a purer atmosphere, an atmosphere of thanksgiving and devotion. Each sect finds in its peculiar method of worship something exalted and blissful. And I might safely appeal to intelligent observation, to decide whether the members of the various sects are not as upright, contented, and happy throughout life as Universalists; so that I am incurring no danger, either to myself or to my readers, in advocating "Partialism." But what advantage can Uni-

versalist writers and preachers offer to those who become converts to their creed? Verily, none; for if their theory be true, these Partialists will be saved along with the rest of mankind, without being converted to Universalism. Theirs is the last faint hope for salvation, and if it proves false, there is nothing below upon which to depend. All agree that consistent and faithful orthodox Christians are absolutely sure of heaven, and if Universalists admit that there is the least possibility, the least shadow of a possibility, that their creed is false, they admit that orthodoxy is safer than Universalism, and that no man would be justifiable in exchanging the one for the other. Thus, before one can become an honest preacher of Universalism, he must be able to preclude even the most minute possibility of error; and to do this he must understand God's plan of salvation to perfection; he must be positively *all-wise*. Universalists attempt to justify themselves by saying that it is to remove the fear of an endless hell that they preach. But who is so troubled with the fear of hell? Certainly not the believers in orthodoxy; for, while to them the Scriptures speak of an everlasting punishment beyond the resurrection, they also point out a way of escape so plain that all may understand it, so easy that all may follow it. Those who are in this way have no fear, for they are in no danger; and those who are without the way, have not enough fear to induce them to make the slightest effort required to reach a place of safety. Even if some wretched fellow does occasionally lose a little sleep in thinking of the fearful record which he must meet at the day of judgment, when he starts up on the resurrection morn, only to find that the judgment took place throughout the Christian dispensation, or at the destruction of Jerusalem, or nobody knows when, and that he is immediately to be turned loose in the fields of Paradise, methinks he will not stop to curse orthodox preachers for the little scare they gave him, so much better than he expected or deserved will be the end. Comparing the short period of human life with a never-ending eternity, and considering the paltry advantage which Universalism claims for its followers, it seems but madness to risk so much in order to gain so little.

To notice in detail every argument which Universalists use in support of their creed, would require more space than I can devote to this part of the present work; so that we may only examine the general principles upon which they rest their faith, and the general plan of their arguments in support of the same.

The most popular and effective method of making converts ever yet adopted by the advocates of this doctrine, is the *a priori* "reasoning" from the attributes of God. A list of the attributes, more or less complete, is made out from the Scriptures, and from these attributes a deity is constructed. Then it is quite easy to decide just what course such a deity will pursue with his creatures. Universalists have analyzed their deity, have examined each attribute separately, and of course when they put these together again, they can fully demonstrate what this bundle of attributes, which they call God, will do. Let us see how Williamson proves his point, by selecting *wisdom*, *power*, and *goodness* as the elements of which his deity shall be composed: "That God is possessed of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness, no man who believes the Bible can question. Now, it will not be disputed, that a God of infinite wisdom could, if he were so disposed, devise a plan which, if carried into effect, would result in the final and complete happiness of all the creatures of his creation. There is just as little doubt that infinite goodness would seek this, the best of all possible objects. Neither can it be doubted that almighty power could execute the plan suggested by goodness and contrived by wisdom. It is, therefore, evident that the result of the combined action of these admitted attributes of the Deity, is the very thing for which we are contending, and this conclusion cannot be avoided without denying the perfection of one or all of these attributes of God. If we say he could not do it, we limit his wisdom or power, and if we say he would not, we deny his goodness; and in either case we deny that God which the Bible sets forth, and all nature teaches us to adore." (*Exposition of Universalism*, p.149.) It will be seen that his conclusion is quite clear from the character of the God which he supposes, but is this the God revealed in the

Bible? Not at all. Our author has taken only wisdom, power, and goodness; why did he forget to enumerate *justice*,—"righteousness," "equity," "judgment," "truth," and "faithfulness?" why did he forget *vengeance*—"wrath," "indignation," "anger," "severity," "jealousy," and "fury?" If he had taken the trouble to examine, he would have found these latter attributes and traits of the Divine mind, quite as clearly set forth in the Scriptures as the three attributes which he selected. But, to have included them would have entirely destroyed his argument.

By garbling the attributes of God, as Mr. Williamson has done, we could just as easily prove *universal damnation*. Let us take wisdom, power, and vengeance, and with them follow his plan of argument. Now, it will not be disputed that a God of infinite wisdom could, if he were so disposed, devise a plan which, if carried into effect, would result in the final and complete damnation of all the creatures of his creation. There is just as little doubt that infinite vengeance would seek this, the worst of all possible objects. Neither can it be doubted that almighty power could execute the plan suggested by vengeance and contrived by wisdom. It is, therefore, evident that the result of the combined action of these admitted attributes of the Deity, is the very thing for which we are contending, and this conclusion cannot be avoided without denying the perfection of one or all these attributes of God. If we say he could not do it, we limit his wisdom or power, and if we say he would not, we deny his vengeance; and in either case, we deny that God which the Bible sets forth, and all nature teaches us to hate! All will agree that this kind of argument is supreme folly, yet it is precisely as valid as that of the Universalist author quoted. Indeed, it has been well remarked, that vengeance is more exclusively an attribute of God than either of the others named; for while wisdom, power, goodness, and justice are attributes of God, they are, also, in some degree, attributes of man; but "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." (Rom. xii. 19.)

Quite frequently the argument is narrowed down to a still smaller compass. Universalists seem willing to rest their

whole cause upon the single statement that "God is love." (1 John iv. 8.) And in the hands of talented and experienced speakers and writers, this little sentence is often made to do excellent service among the ignorant and thoughtless. It is contended that "The very essence, the whole nature of God is benevolence, goodness, or love." "When, therefore, we say God is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, etc., we do but say, Love is infinitely wise, powerful, just, merciful, etc., these being but the modifications and attributes of infinite love." "When we say all are created, controlled, governed, and disposed by God, we do but say, Love creates, controls, governs, and disposes all." "All mankind, not excepting saints nor sinners; every intelligent creature throughout the vast and unbounded empire of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and in time to come, by almighty and infinite goodness, and by all-pervading and omnipresent *love*! Moreover, God being love, he cannot exist aside from his nature; and if God should ever cease to love the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is love!" From this, and much more of the same style, it is argued that all will be saved.

But, if this is allowed to be a legitimate method of reasoning, we can again prove universal damnation beyond a doubt; for while it is true that "God is love," it is also true that "Our God is a consuming fire." (Heb. xii. 29.) "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." (Rom. xii. 19.) "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil," etc. (Rom. ii. 8, 9.) Taking these passages as a text, Alexander Hall thus follows the plan of the argument just presented: "The very essence, the whole nature of God is indignation, vengeance, or a consuming fire." "When, therefore, we say God is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just, we do but say that a consuming fire is infinitely wise, jealous, powerful, and just, these being but modifications, and attributes of infinite vengeance." "When we say all are created, controlled, governed, and disposed by God, we do but say that a consuming fire creates, controls, governs, and disposes of all." "All mankind, not excepting

saints nor sinners; every intelligent creature throughout the vast and unbounded dominions of Jehovah, are forever surrounded, encircled, upheld, above, around, beneath, in life, in death, in time present, and time to come, by almighty and infinite vengeance, and by an all-pervading and omnipresent consuming fire! Moreover, God, being a consuming fire, cannot exist aside from his nature, and if he should ever cease to burn the sinner, that moment he ceases to be God, for God is a consuming fire!" "From all this I draw the logical and unavoidable conclusion—*universal damnation!*" (*Universalism against Itself*, p. 349.)

From the foregoing, it is perfectly evident that, from such a confused mass as our knowledge of the attributes of God, we can prove absolutely nothing. God is wise, but how wise? He is good, but how good? He is love, but what is love? He possesses "righteousness," "truth," and "faithfulness," "wrath," "indignation," and "fury," but how shall we define all these qualities? Considering the many qualities which are attributed to God, separately and in combinations, we could prove an almost infinite number of theories in regard to his dealings with man. Combining all the qualities of God mentioned in the Scriptures, and the infinite number of others which might have been mentioned, we have a being so incomprehensible that it is utterly impossible to reason from what he *is* to what he will *do*. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" (Job xi. 7.) Mr. Skinner had, perhaps, read this language, for he says: "Reason, I admit, cannot comprehend all truth—it cannot find the Almighty out to perfection." Thus he admits the imperfection of reason, but on the very next page he declares, "I object, then to the doctrine of endless suffering, because it is *unreasonable*." And he proceeds to analyze the character of Jehovah, and lay before his readers the exact course which God must pursue in order to be consistent with himself. It will be found that a vast proportion of the so-called reasoning of Universalists, is upon this *a priori* method; all those beautiful and affecting illustrations are framed upon this plan.

But God has not left us to such an uncertain and presumptuous.

VOL. VIII. NO. I.—3.

tuous method of determining his course with sinful mortals; he has *told* us what he will do. How much easier and more conclusive would it be to turn to his Word, and read his direct revelation concerning this matter: "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: *whither I go, ye cannot come.*" (John viii. 21.) In the direct arguments against Universalism which I shall present further on, I shall appeal, not to my imperfect knowledge of the attributes of God, but to direct revelation.

Another plea which has been presented in manifold forms, is based upon the assumption that God has *purposed* the salvation of all. Of course, if this be admitted, since God is infinite in power, he will, without doubt, accomplish that purpose, and save all men. But we are sadly in need of proof that such is, ever has been, or ever will be the purpose of God. Mr. Skinner, in his *Doctrinal Sermons*, maintains that God's purpose was to save the whole race of mankind, from four considerations.

1. From his *goodness*. He says: "All agree that it was goodness which led God to create man for a benevolent end. Goodness cannot desire misery; its only desire is happiness. 'The Lord is good, and doeth good.' 'Love worketh no ill.' If, therefore, God is good to all, he must purpose their salvation." This last statement is the very thing which needs to be proved. It will be admitted that God is good to all, but to what degree is he good, and in what does his goodness consist? Any man of intelligence must agree that he is good to that degree, and in that direction, which he claims for himself in his word; and what this is we shall soon see. To affirm that goodness necessitates a *purpose* to save all men, is the merest assumption. Nay, more; it is an assumption contrary to fact; for "The Lord is good"—at the present, yet the world is filled with lamentation on account of suffering; degradation and misery of the most appalling character are seen upon every hand, all permitted by Divine goodness. Now, if there ever comes a time when he will not allow sinful men to suffer, Jehovah will need to become very much better than he is at present (so to speak); and this Universalists

would hardly admit to be possible, for they are continually thundering it into our ears that God is unchangeable.

2. He claims that God has *purposed* to save all from the fact that he has *willed* it. Upon this he says: "It would be a singular fallacy to say that God's purpose and will are at variance, for this would represent him as laboring against himself, and forming plans to disappoint his own desires. We cannot, therefore, allow any such variance; and, consequently, when we know what the will of God is, we shall know his purpose." This, again, is bare assumption. Remember the lamentation of Jesus over Jerusalem, when he exclaims, "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." (Matt. xxiii. 37.) Jesus certainly *willed*, or *desired*, that Jerusalem should be saved, but was not that wicked city destroyed, nevertheless? Perchance some one will object to this text as proof that God does not purpose all that he wills, saying that Jesus was not divine, and that his will was no more likely to be accomplished than the will of Peter, Paul, or any other good man. I will not argue that point in this connection, but ask such persons to remember how often the will of *Jehovah*, the God of Israel, was thwarted. "But my people would not hearken unto my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their hearts' lust: and they walked in their own counsels." And, then, in the intensity of his desire for the welfare of his people, he cries, "Oh that my people had hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways!" (Psalms lxxxi. 11-13.) "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end!" (Deut. xxxii. 29.) In these and many other passages, it is most clearly taught that God *desired*, or *willed*, that Israel would hearken unto him and be wise, but they refused, thus thwarting that will. Most assuredly God has not *purposed* all that he has *willed*.

3. He claims that God has *purposed* universal salvation from the fact of the death of Christ. Hear him again: "Jesus was a propitiation for sin; he died to take away sin. He gave himself a ransom for sinners. All, then, for whom he died must be embraced in God's purpose of mercy." Those

who are at all acquainted with Universalism, will recognize this as a standard argument, especially with those who are not very well versed in their own, or anybody else's theology. It is so easy to make the sweeping assertion that "Christ died for all, hence all will be saved;" for if this be not true, it is claimed, a part of Christ's blood must have been shed in vain. It is true that Christ is the propitiation (*hilasmos*), the means of appeasing, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; but it does not follow that the sacrifice was made in obedience to a Divine purpose to save all men. Mr. Skinner supposes the purpose to have been formed before the sacrifice; indeed, he refers to this sacrifice as proof of the previously existing purpose. Now, if God had already purposed to save all unconditionally, what need was there of a sacrifice? Or, if we suppose the purpose to be formed at the same time it was determined to make the sacrifice, why should God carry out this purpose at so great a cost—the blood of his only begotten Son? An unconditional purpose to save all the race of man, without regard to merit, would certainly not demand a Saviour's blood to effect its fulfillment. Again, it presents rather a strange view of the Saviour to suppose that he left the courts of heaven, came to earth, and freely offered himself a ransom for sin, all that he might give unconditional salvation to every man. If man's agency was not to be consulted, he could just as well have saved all by a divine decree without a sacrifice. Since a sacrifice is an unnecessary thing, when used in connection with an unconditional decree to save all men, and since it is certain that the sacrifice was made, it follows that no such decree ever existed.

4. Our author affirms that "The *Scriptures* are explicit in regard to God's purpose." The sum total of his scripture testimony is contained in two passages: 1. "For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Heb. ii. 14, 15.) The argument is, that Christ became a partaker of flesh and blood that he might destroy the devil. But Universalists hold that

the devil is simply a personification of evil in its various forms; and it would be difficult for them to explain how Christ has or will destroy this personification of evil in any way consistent with their theory. They admit that evil exists to-day, and always will exist until the resurrection, and that then evil will be destroyed without the agency of Christ. So that after all Christ will never destroy any kind of a devil in any absolute sense. The most that can be said is, that he has so destroyed the power of the devil, as that man may renounce allegiance to him, and flee from his dominion. (2.) "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." (Eph. i. 9, 10.) Paul told the Ephesians that God had revealed unto them the mystery of his *will*, but, as we have shown, the fact that God had willed that a certain state of things should come to pass, is no evidence that he had purposed it.

God indeed had purposed or designed a certain good pleasure, and according to this good pleasure he had *willed* that in the dispensation of the fulness of times certain things should come to pass. This is the evident meaning of the text.

I have now examined each of the author's arguments in favor of a divine purpose to save all men in the future world, and each has been shown to be fallacious. I have dwelt somewhat at length upon the arguments of this particular writer, because they are the gist of a large proportion of the reasoning of Universalists everywhere.

It does not require a very exalted intellect to discover that God has not purposed or decreed anything concerning man's salvation, either in time or in eternity, except that every man should be morally free to *choose* good or evil, life or death. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." (Deut. xxx. 19.) "Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find

me; for that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord." (Prov. i. 28, 29.) The power of *choice*, volition, is throughout the Scriptures set forth in the clearest terms. Not only so, but men are *praised* or *blamed*, according to their actions, whether good or evil. "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I have delivered them to you." (1 Cor. ii. 2.) "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." (Gal. ii. 11.) It would puzzle the brains of the wisest man living to explain how a man can be praiseworthy or blameworthy for doing that which he cannot avoid doing. Almost every chapter in the Bible commends or condemns men for the character of their actions, yet if they be not free to exercise a choice, all this commendation and condemnation is the merest foolishness. And further still, if we be not free moral agents, then God has stamped a *lie* upon the conscience of every man born into the world. That man never lived who did not possess a consciousness of right and wrong, of innocence and guilt, as deeply seated as the consciousness of his own existence. All within and around us conspires to prove that we are independent, intelligent beings, and that we originate and put into execution, that we plan and act, of ourselves and for ourselves; yet restricted, of course, by the limits of our finite knowledge and power. God plans and executes with infinite wisdom and power, and is responsible only to himself. We, in our restricted sphere, are responsible to ourselves in a certain degree, and also responsible to him who placed us under moral government. Since God has repeatedly declared that he hates sins in all its forms, it follows that sin originated with his creatures themselves, and that God did not in any sense decree it. But Universalists maintain that God certainly foreknew that man would abuse his liberty by originating sin, and that knowing this, God would be unjust to create man, and then inflict upon him endless punishment for the sins he might commit. On the same principle, they ought to hold that God is unjust to inflict even the limited punishment which man receives in this life. God could have obviated the necessity of punishing man even in the slightest degree

by simply withholding his existence. Yes, it is true, no doubt, that when the Almighty planned and framed the universe, when he filled up the immensity of space with system revolving about system, to a distance, from the conception of which the finite mind shrinks back in awe; when he saw with one glance the history and destiny of the various ranks of intelligences which were about to spring into existence at this time, I say he evidently foreknew that his creatures upon this little atom which we call earth, would get themselves into trouble by abusing the liberty which he was about to give them, yet, "he saw that it was better, all things considered, to have a moral system, even though some of the subjects of his moral empire should rebel, and, by their undesired, and undecreed abuse of freedom, introduce discord and spiritual death into one or two provinces of his vast dominions."—*Rev. Henry Melville.*

If, now, I have succeeded in showing that Universalism cannot be proved either from the attributes or the purposes of God, I have effectually uprooted the system; for these two assumptions constitute the foundation of its theological structure; and it is by using these as fulcra, that Universalists attempt to force out Universalism from the few texts of Scripture which they press into the service.

It is a significant fact, that the doctrine of man's accountability after death for the deeds done in this life, has formed a prominent feature in almost all the religious systems entertained among men. There have been few heathen creeds in the world's history which have not taught that man is immortal, and that his happiness in the future life depends upon his course of conduct while in the world. A prominent organ of Universalism admits this: "A hell for the punishment of souls after death is plainly taught in every system of ancient paganism."—*Manford's Magazine.* It seems almost universally ingrafted into the human mind that this life is a probationary state, a state of preparation for the happiness or misery which is to follow in the next. This, it seems to me, must be explained upon one of two suppositions: either that the doctrine has been transmitted by tradition, or that it is intuitive with all men.

1. If we admit that the doctrine of future punishment has been transmitted by tradition, in view of the fact that the doctrine has obtained such a firm hold in all ages, and among nations having no connection or intercourse, we must admit, further, that such tradition must have originated very early in the history of the race, before mankind became dispersed to the various parts of the world. In short, it is most reasonable to suppose that it originated in Eden. Man, in the beginning, had a knowledge of the true God; and from God himself came the warning: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Our first parents evidently understood by this that in the day they partook of the forbidden fruit, they died a spiritual death. The image of their Creator, which had been implanted in their hearts, had been marred and broken, and broken must it remain throughout a never-ending eternity, unless he would again breathe into them the breath of life. And however they may have understood the faint promise that the seed of the woman should bruise or tread upon the serpent's head, this certainly could not have given them the hope that God would unconditionally restore them to life. Death is in its nature unchangeable; and death, having followed as a result of violated law, would, without doubt, continue throughout their existence, unless they desired and made an effort to obtain life. Now, so deeply was this truth implanted in the human intellect in the beginning, either by implication, as we have seen, or by direct revelation, that even when men began to forget the true God, and to substitute in his stead visible objects made with their own hands, they were still striving to avoid the eternal death of the future, by calling upon their gods to be reconciled to them, to restore them to their lost estate of purity and happiness. This one doctrine, along with the practice of offering sacrifices for the remission of sins, was carried from generation to generation, and embodied in all the prominent religious systems, and has been, almost without exception, the world's theology.

2. If the foregoing explanation cannot be accepted, then there seems no other conclusion than that the doctrine of future punishment is an intuitive truth implanted by the Crea-

tor in every human intellect. Either supposition is fatal to Universalism; for whether God revealed the doctrine to our first parents in Eden, or stamps it indelibly upon the tablet of each human heart, or (which is most likely) first revealed it, and then confirms the truth in every conscience, it is equally true. And this whole consideration forms the very strongest presumptive evidence against Universalism.

Let us now more closely compare the claims of Universalism with the Word of God. We have heard the proclamation of universal salvation to every sinner of Adam's race; let us inquire into the nature of salvation as spoken of in the Scriptures. The word salvation, *soteria* in the Greek, means, primarily, deliverance from danger; hence, the act of making safe. It is clear, then, that there can be no salvation unless there is something from which men are saved, unless there is some evil to which men are exposed, and from which they are delivered. There can be no salvation, that is, no making safe, when men are already safe. Now, let us apply this definition to the theory under consideration. Universalists agree that man is exposed to the punishment of sin, but do they teach that any man was ever, or will ever be delivered from this punishment? Nay, verily. Says a writer of the "sublime" faith, "Set it down, as one of the peculiar doctrines of Universalism, that no man can, by any possibility, escape a just punishment for his sins. We believe in the forgiveness of sin, not in the remission of punishment, and neither forgiveness nor atonement, nor repentance, nor anything else, can step in between the sinner and the penalty of the violated law." So now it is certain there can be no salvation from punishment. The advocates of the theory set forth with the greatest emphasis, that Christ does not save men from punishment. But perhaps men are saved from sickness and sorrow, from accident and death. Wrong again; for I believe they universally hold that all the suffering to which man is exposed in this life, is the result of violated law on the part of those suffering; that all the evils incident to mortality are sent directly as the punishment of sin, and any salvation from these would be a salvation from punishment, which they reject. So it is further established

that man can be saved from nothing which is painful or even unpleasant to him. In short, there is, during life, no such thing as a direct salvation.

It may be possible that some one will say that there is danger beyond the grave, from which somebody will be saved. Mistaken, once more. Indeed, some Universalists do maintain that some men, at least, will suffer to some extent after death. They teach that there is a kind of purgatory, where those sinners who happen to be in arrears with the Almighty when he calls them to a settlement, may settle up their old scores, and get ready for heaven; but they will not allow that there is any remission of punishment even here, and we can hardly conceive how long God may keep some abominable wretches in this place, paying up their debts, before he can say, "It is enough, come up higher." Finally, in heaven there can be no salvation, since those who enter there are already safe, are already saved; there is to them no danger, but certain and unending bliss.

We have canvassed the whole ground; we have followed man from the cradle to the grave, and from the grave through an endless existence beyond; yet we can find no danger to which he is directly exposed, from which he has ever or will ever be delivered. Man is saved from nothing. The salvation of Universalism, instead of being universal, is, in fact, no salvation at all; and, if the doctrine be true, this word which occurs so often in the Scriptures, together with all its equivalent expressions, is an unmeaning term, and ought to be forever stricken out of the Word of God.

But we shall see how directly opposed to this doctrine is the scriptural use of the word salvation. When the hosts of Israel were encamped by the Red Sea, with no possibility of escape upon the right or upon the left, and when they beheld in their rear the approach of the Egyptian army, threatening swift and sure destruction, Moses, seeing the danger, and knowing that God would deliver them, commanded, "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." The waters were divided, Israel was rescued, and, standing upon the farther shore, looking over the troubled expanse of the deep, which had overwhelmed the horse and rider of their pursuers, the

assembled host sang, "The Lord is my strength and song, he is become my salvation." (Exodus xiv. 13; xv. 2.) This salvation was a real deliverance from a real danger. In like manner it taught that men are saved from actual dangers in a spiritual sense. Peter, in beginning his first epistle, declares, "Ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." (1 Pet. i. 8, 9.) Christ's mission was to save. The angel announced to Joseph, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. i. 21.) I will here introduce what Universalists claim to be the only meaning of the word when used in connection with man's moral conduct, and the only sense in which Christ was, or is, a Saviour. I have before me articles from two of their authors upon this point, and find that they teach precisely the same thing; viz., that Jesus saves men only from ignorance, fear, and the practice of sinning. But, since ignorance and fear are the result, perhaps I should say the punishment of sin, and will disappear when the practice of sinning is discontinued, we may as well say that Universalism teaches that Jesus saves men from nothing except the act or practice of sinning. This they call the special salvation of the believer. "For, therefore, we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." (1 Tim. iv. 10.) They do, however, further claim that God is the Saviour of all men in an absolute, unconditional sense; that is, that God will take all men to heaven. Yet, when we remember that they tell us there never was, nor will be, a hell beyond the grave, nor any suffering of any kind beyond the resurrection, we must call it the merest nonsense to say that God will save all men in heaven, when, in fact, there is no danger after death from which he will or can deliver them. It certainly is supreme folly to assert that God will save all men in heaven when there is no other place where he could put them!

So there is nothing in heaven or hell, earth or purgatory from which men are saved, except the practice of sinning. We will now reduce this salvation to nonentity, and explode the doctrine. The act or practice of sinning is, *per se*, not a

danger; all the danger consists in the punishment of sin. So, then, the breaking off from the practice is not a deliverance from danger; hence, not a salvation in any direct sense. At most, it is but an indirect salvation, such as any man may grant to his neighbor, by persuading him to give up some of his bad habits. It was promised that Jesus would "save his people from their sins;" literally, "from the sins of them." Now, the sins of a people are not their sins until after they have been committed, and a salvation which only prevents them from committing sin, is not a salvation from their sins, and is not the kind of salvation which Jesus would give. A salvation from their sins can only be granted after the commission of the sins, and, of course, can mean nothing else than a salvation from the punishment of their sins. Again, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." (1 Tim. i. 15.) The word *harmartolous*, here rendered "sinners," means those sinful, or those hardened in sin. Jesus came, not only as a teacher to shed a flood of moral light upon the world, and thus turn men from the practice of sin, but also as a Saviour, to save those who had actually committed sin, were hardened in sin, and hence were called sinners, as in this text. Now, to what danger are sinners most exposed? From what do they most need to be rescued? All will agree that it is the punishment of their sins. Nothing can be properly called a salvation which leaves them to suffer out the direful penalty which hangs over them; and it would be difficult to conceive how Jesus could save one in the character of a sinner in any other way than by saving him from this penalty.

Therefore, my first direct argument against Universalism is, *That it denies the doctrine of salvation as taught in the Scriptures; it denies that men are saved, or that Christ is, in any proper sense, a Saviour.*

My second direct argument against Universalism is, *That it denies the doctrine of the atonement of Christ; or, more particularly, it denies the vicarious or substituted sufferings of Christ.*

As already seen, Universalists teach that no punishment due to sin is ever remitted, and thus an atonement is to their

system an unnecessary thing; and their authors spend much time, and not a little ingenuity, in trying to banish the doctrine from the Scriptures; but, as we shall find, there are even yet traces of it left in the Word of God. I am aware that orthodox Christians are not entirely agreed as to the precise nature of the atonement, but it will be sufficient for our present purpose to say that Christ was the sacrifice for sin; that he bore the punishment due to sin. Just at this point I am interrupted by Mr. Williamson, who asks, "What was the punishment which was due the sinner?" I answer, Condemnation and death. Then, with some alarm, he continues, "And did God condemn Christ as a sinner, and treat him as such?" Exactly so: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) That is, God hath made him, or regarded him, as a sinner in our stead. Again, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on the tree." (Gal. iii. 13.) The doctrine of "imputation" is plainly taught in these two texts. It is, in substance, that God has graciously donated the righteousness of Christ to believers, and has accepted them as righteous on account of the same; "Their sins being imputed to him, and his righteousness being imputed to them, they are, in virtue thereof, both acquitted from guilt, and accepted as righteous."

But, the objector replies, that neither righteousness nor guilt are commodities that can be transferred from one to another, as merchandize. "They are both personal matters; things which pertain to individuals, and cannot be separated from them." Quite right, Doctor; righteousness cannot be made inherent in a man once sinful, neither can guilt be removed from the soul. The man who has committed a theft may serve ten years in State's prison, yet he will return just as guilty as when he went. Or, he may be pardoned; that is, released from punishment, by the Governor, yet he will remain guilty. So also, if the same man should endure the full extent of punishment which should be demanded in the moral government of God, or if God should pardon him, he

would yet be guilty through all eternity. But, while righteousness and guilt are not transferable, punishment is; and when punishment is transferred from the guilty man, he is regarded and treated as righteous; Christ's righteousness is imputed to him.

It is sometimes argued by Universalists, that if Christ's sufferings procured a possible freedom from punishment for all men, then his sufferings must have been equal to the sum total of all the punishment due all the sins which all men could commit. Such a supposition is not at all necessary. Christ suffered sufficiently to make a perfect atonement: so the Scriptures teach us; and such an atonement would save all men as well as one man. Whether the superior merit of Christ gave greater merit to his sufferings, and thus justice required from him less than the sum total of punishment due to man, is a question which need not trouble us in this connection.

Isaiah, in looking to that Redeemer who was as a "Lamb slain before the foundation of the world," declares, "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." Universalism, on the contrary, teaches that we do, every one of us, bear our own griefs, and carry our own sorrows. The prophet continues: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Universalism again responds, "We are wounded for our transgressions, we are bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace is upon ourselves; and with our own stripes we are healed." Again, hear Isaiah: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way: and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Universalism denies, saying, "The Lord hath laid on ourselves the iniquity of us all." Yet the prophet proceeds: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. He hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors;" (does not this look a little like imputation of guilt?) "and he bare the sin of many."

But Universalism denies this *in toto*, declaring that Christ

shall justify nobody, that he shall bear the iniquity and sin of none, that every man shall justify himself by bearing his own iniquities. (Isaiah liii.)

Passing to the New Testament, we hear the apostle echoing the words of the prophet, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. ix. 28.) And, finally, Peter, with a clearness and force which places the matter beyond doubt, declares, "Who," referring to Christ, "his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live into righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." (1 Pet. ii. 24.) I have introduced but a small part of the evidence which the Scriptures afford on this point; yet what sane man would demand more? These texts do most directly and unequivocally prove that Christ suffered in our stead; that the penalty of violated law is already paid; and, as we shall presently see, we only need to accept the sacrifice in order to be freed from punishment. Universalism may boast of its "cash system," of its system of "paying as you go along," but in the councils of eternity there was devised a better system, a system by which we may purchase freedom from sin and the punishment of sin, "without money and without price." And since Universalism positively contradicts all this testimony in favor of the atonement, by teaching that Christ bore the punishment of no sins, but that every man, in his own body, is punished for his own sins, Universalism cannot be true.

I might safely rest the case here, but will present my third argument, which is closely connected with the foregoing. It is this: *Universalism denies the doctrine of the remission of sins.*

Not only does the word of God teach that Christ has met the demands of the law, and provided salvation for the whole world, but it does teach, further, that upon compliance with certain conditions, the sins of men are actually remitted, pardoned, and remembered no more against them.

Universalism, however, has "sought out many inventions," and I have before me a sermon in which there is made a desperate attempt to prove that the forgiveness of sin consists merely in the removing of sin, and not in the remission of pun-

ishment; and that men are pardoned in no case until after they have paid the full penalty of their misdeeds. Such an attempt is so plainly absurd that it will not require an extended notice. Suppose, reader, (for the sake of illustration, merely,) that you had been condemned for crime by the civil law, and after you had served out your entire term in the penitentiary, the Governor of your State should very graciously pardon you, what would you think of such an act? Would you not be indignant at such mockery? Would you not then claim freedom as a right, and spurn the insolence or folly which would offer a pardon? Then, if the language of Scripture has any meaning at all, how can it be said that God will first punish a man to the fullest extent, and afterwards forgive all his sins?

Our Saviour taught us to pray, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." (Matt. vi. 12.) Let us now turn to Luke's version of the same prayer: "And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." (Luke xi. 4.) So, by comparison, it is made certain that the debts referred to in the first instance are our sins; and we are to pray and expect that our Father will forgive our sins as we forgive our debtors. Now, how do we forgive our debtors? Universalism would say, by requiring them to pay the last farthing they owe us, and then never allowing them to go in debt to us again. But common sense and all observation say that we can forgive our debtors only by relinquishing our claims upon them; freeing them from their obligations to us. And thus God will forgive us, by releasing us from the debt of punishment which is due on account of sin. We are to pray, "Forgive us our sins." What sins? Our future sins? Assuredly not; for sins must be *com*-mitted before they can be *re*-mitted. Then it must mean our past sins; and it would be impossible to forgive past sins in any other way than by remitting the punishment thereof.

Hear the words of the Psalmist: "But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not." (Psalms lxxviii. 38.) The unavoidable inference is, that, if God had not forgiven their iniquities, he would have destroyed them; and forgiveness here can mean nothing else than de-

liverance from destruction, which was the punishment due their iniquity. The prophet proclaims, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." (Isaiah lv. 7.) Here are two distinct things which must be done by the sinful man: he must first turn from his wickedness, and then "return unto the Lord," but the pardon consists in neither of these, for these conditions are performed by the man himself. But it is promised that on account of his compliance with these conditions, afterward the Lord will have mercy upon him and pardon. Now, after a man has forsaken sin, and begun a life of righteousness, how can mercy or pardon be extended to him in any way except in the removal of the punishment due for past offenses?

Micah exclaims, "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage?" (Micah vii. 18.) Truly, the God of Universalism is not the God whom the prophet addressed, for this God does neither pardon the iniquity, nor pass by the transgression of any body, but requires his creatures to suffer whatever punishment their iniquity and transgression could, in the strictest justice, deserve.

It would be useless to further examine the word of God as revealed to his people Israel, for Peter sums up the matter in these words: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.)

It is scarcely necessary to recall the words of Christ himself while he was instituting an ordinance which should be forever observed in remembrance of him: "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." And in the last conversation which he held with his disciples, but a few moments before "he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven," our Saviour reminded them that it had been written, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv. 47.)

Thus the prophets and apostles, and Christ himself, all bear
VOL. VIII. NO. I.—4.

witness that our God is a God of mercy, a God of compassion and long suffering, a God of love. We are taught that he has no pleasure in the suffering of fallen humanity. He sits not in awful majesty afar off in some corner of the universe, looking with calm indifference upon a race of his creatures, the workmanship and image of himself, lingering out a miserable existence in folly and sin. He leaves them not to suffer the direful penalty of their misdeeds, until desperation has driven them deeper and deeper in sin; but to all men he comes with offers of pardon and freedom upon conditions simple and easy. Universalism, on the contrary, represents God as visiting swift and sure punishment upon every offender for every offense; as showing no mercy, but in the most strict and unyielding justice, requiring the penalty of a broken law unto the uttermost farthing. All the stereotyped declamation of Universalist preachers about "a God of cruelty," "a hideous monster," or "an unfeeling tyrant," comes with very poor grace when, in the next sentence, they tell us that the God of Universalism, notwithstanding the atonement of Jesus our Saviour; notwithstanding repentance and faith on man's part, will never remit the smallest degree from the intensity of suffering which man's offenses could deserve. Let reason decide whether the God of orthodoxy be more "cruel" than the Deity of Universalism; and let reason decide which of the two most resembles the God revealed in the Scriptures.

My fourth argument against Universalism is contained in these three propositions: 1. *Some men do die in sin.* 2. *There is no evidence of an essential change in the character of the soul in death.* 3. *It is distinctly taught that there will be no change in the soul after death.*

Some souls, being unholy at death, will continue unholy, and, consequently, unhappy, as long as they shall continue to exist. As to the first proposition, viz., that some men do die in sin, there is, perhaps, no room for controversy. I suppose that Universalism, in common with every other system, admits this. Christ said to some who stood about him in the temple at Jerusalem, "Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come." (John viii. 21.)

The Scriptures elsewhere, as well as all observation, teach that in their dying moments some men are sinful and unfit for heaven; indeed, as much so as at any time during their lives.

As to the second proposition, viz., that the soul is not essentially changed in death, there is no greater occasion of dispute. Yet, it must be remembered, that sin pertains to the soul. "I said, Lord, be merciful unto me: heal my soul; for I have sinned against thee." (Psalms xli. 4.) Now, David, in using this language, understood that his soul was affected and needed healing on account of his sin against the Most High. But the body and soul of man, whatever may be their relations during the physical life, are essentially two different substances. The disembodied spirit is capable of an independent and complete existence. And since the spirit is not dependent upon the physical being, but is, indeed, the predominating element, the essence, the life of the individual, to which the body is, as it were, a temporary appendage, there can be no reason to suppose that it will be changed in character by the cessation of the physical functions, which we call death. The physical machine or body breaks or wears out, yet the character of the man remains the same. I am aware that it is quite generally believed that man does never in this life reach sinless perfection; that "There abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part;" and that, therefore, all who immediately enter a state of happiness must in some degree be changed in death. But, admitting this to be true, our position is not weakened. We may easily suppose that in the truly regenerate man there will, until death, remain some taints of sin, caused by the connection with the flesh; "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." (Gal. v. 17.) But, although Paul would teach that "ye," that is, the essential part of the being, are in some degree corrupted by the flesh, "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would," yet it is plain that when the flesh is removed, these taints will no longer be present, and the regenerate soul may do what it would. But to suppose that the removal of the flesh

will regenerate or create anew a soul which is in itself unholy, and which has become more unholy by a long alienation from the Father of all souls, is another, and quite a different thing.

In regard to the third proposition, viz., that the soul is not changed after death, we find all are not so well agreed. Perhaps all Universalists agree that some men die sinful, and that death does not fit the soul for heaven; but they usually hold that there is a change in the character of every man after death. They teach that in the resurrection all will be made holy and happy. Manford, in his "Universalist Faith," says: "Returning to dust is death; returning to God is the resurrection." That is, the resurrection is returning to God, entering upon a state of bliss. The text most relied upon to prove this is the language of Paul, 1 Cor. xv.: "Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." But this passage by no means refutes our proposition. The word resurrection means a rising again, a bringing to life, and is entirely a physical process; for nothing save the body can need to be raised or brought to life. The soul is not sleeping in the grave, waiting to be raised; the soul is not dead, waiting to be brought to life. The body only is to be changed. "This corruptible must put on incorruption;" is the soul corruptible? "This mortal must put on immortality;" is the soul mortal? Universalists do not generally avowedly believe that the soul dies. And will the fact that God will perform a physical process upon the body, make any change in the character of the soul? Hall offers another argument: Paul declares Christ to be "the first fruits" of the resurrection; so, if resurrection means a change in the moral character; Christ was sinful before, and was made holy in this resurrection; if resurrection means conversion, then Christ is the first convert to Christianity!

To those Universalists who maintain that the moral charac-

ters of all men will be changed in the resurrection, I wish to present another difficulty. If the souls of all men are made holy and happy in the resurrection, it follows that none are fitted for heaven before the resurrection. Now, I wish to inquire in regard to the state of the soul between death and the resurrection. During this period the soul cannot be holy and happy, for it is not changed except in the resurrection; and most of this class of Universalists would tell us that during this period the soul is not unholy and unhappy, for they deny all future punishment. Then what is the state of the soul? If it is neither holy and happy nor unholy and unhappy, we are driven to the conclusion that the soul of man dies with the body, and with the body is brought to life; man must die, soul and body, just as his horse or his dog dies. Yet they teach that the soul is immortal. The truth is, this is a chasm in their crude theology which they can never bridge over. Another class would tell us, no doubt, that during the period between death and the resurrection, men are still unholy and unhappy, and that they are undergoing disciplinary punishment, until all shall be raised to an inheritance of glory in the resurrection morn.

Then indeed they believe that all men, without distinction, must be punished in this intermediate reform school, which God has established for them. Abraham is yet unholy and unhappy, waiting to be purified in the resurrection; Moses and Elias are yet bound in their sinful natures, waiting to be delivered; David has not yet been permitted to sing the praises of Israel's God in the New Jerusalem; the repentant thief has not yet reached paradise, unless, indeed, paradise is only the name of this immediate state of punishment, and, in that case, Christ went into this punishment also; for he said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." According to the supposition, all the holy men of old are yet in a state of punishment, enjoying the choice companionship of those miserable sinners who perished in Sodom and Gomorrah, because they were too bad to be left with the righteous on the earth! This latter supposition is no more reasonable than the former. So all the divisions and sub-divisions of Universalism must utterly fail to prove that man's moral nature will

be changed in the resurrection. Neither is there any evidence that the soul is changed in its moral character at any time after death; but quite to the contrary the Scriptures teach.

"And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." (Rev. xxii. 10, 11.) The unjust and filthy, the righteous and holy, were to remain in just that moral condition in which they were found at the time which was "at hand." Now, it matters not whether this time is present or future. "Let him be unjust still, let him be filthy still," is the sentence which must rest upon the unjust and filthy soul from that time through all eternity.

We have now found (1) that souls at death are unholy, and consequently unfit for heaven; (2) that in death there is no essential change, and, (3) that after death there is no moral change. Therefore some souls are never made holy and happy; and Universalism, which teaches that all will be made holy and happy, cannot be true.

My fifth direct argument against Universalism, is this: *The Scriptures do clearly teach that in the literal resurrection of the literal dead, there will occur a separation of the just and the unjust; the former entering upon a state of happiness, the latter upon a state of misery.* Daniel records that one appearing as a man, who, in a vision, revealed to him many things concerning the world's history, when coming down to the end of all things earthly, declared "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." (Dan. xii. 2, 3.) It is the fashion of Universalism to affirm that all those passages referring to the resurrection from the grave to an estate of punishment, teach merely a figurative resurrection from the graves of superstition and moral death, and that suffering which is to follow is temporal only. But this text will bear no such interpretation. Notice

that those who sleep in the dust of the earth are to be raised up. It would be a very severe straining of language, to make "dust of the earth" mean graves of moral death. Again, if a figurative resurrection from moral death were meant, there could not remain a distinction in moral character after this resurrection; all alike would have been raised to "life"; but we find that some were to be raised to "shame and everlasting contempt," which could not have been attributed to men who had just been brought from ignorance, superstition and sin, to purity and happiness. And, further, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." From this it appears that the possession of wisdom, and the turning of many to righteousness previous to the resurrection, shall affect their condition afterward; which could not be the case, were all alike spiritually dead before, and spiritually alive after the resurrection referred to. Shining as the firmament and as the stars, it seems to me, could only be applied to the saints in their glorified state, which they will begin at the literal resurrection.

The last verse of the chapter makes it certain that this is the time meant. One had asked, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" After answering this question, the angel addressed Daniel, "But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest," (in the literal dust of the earth) "and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." Thus Daniel himself is to have part in the resurrection of which he writes. And be it remembered that at this same time "some shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt." Christ, when teaching by the seaside, finished his discourse in these words: "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." (Matt. xiii. 47-50.) In considering this text, we need only remember that, at the end of the world the wicked

are to be severed from among the just. Christ says again: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v. 28, 29.) It is also evident that this language can not apply to a figurative resurrection from the graves of moral death, from the fact that before the resurrection there are recognized two classes, the "good" and the "evil"; and the two classes continue in their respective characters afterward, the good enjoying their estate of life, and the evil suffering in their estate of damnation. If this were a figurative resurrection, those who were raised up would all be of the class who come forth to life; for making alive spiritually is making holy, and none who are thus made holy can at the same time come forth unto damnation. Again, some were "good" previous to this resurrection; are the good spiritually dead? Is it possible to raise up a good man from his grave of moral death? In the Revelation of St. John the resurrection of the righteous is called the first resurrection, in distinction from the resurrection of the wicked: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." (Rev. xx. 6.) This plainly implies that there are some who shall not have part in the same resurrection, and that they shall not be "blessed and holy." In conclusion, hear Paul: "Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection." (Heb. ii. 35.) Now, if there is a better resurrection, there is also a worse one; the former cannot be without the latter. And the happiness of those obtaining the worse resurrection cannot equal the happiness of those obtaining the better. Surely those early Christians thought the difference was great, for they were willing to undergo extreme torture, and to reject deliverance from the same, all that they might obtain part in the better resurrection. The Bible student will easily call to mind other texts bearing upon the same point, but those quoted are sufficient to establish it beyond a doubt, that in the literal, physical resurrection, which shall take place after

death, there will still be two classes of men, the just and the unjust; and that, dating from this period, the just shall inherit everlasting life, and the unjust everlasting punishment. And since Universalism teaches that all men will then enter upon everlasting life, Universalism must be false.

As showing more particularly how the separation of the righteous and the wicked shall be accomplished, and as being in close connection with the foregoing, I will introduce my sixth direct argument against Universalism, which is this: *The Holy Scriptures clearly teach that after death, and yet in the future, there will occur a general judgment of all the human race.*

Universalism furnishes two theories respecting the day of judgment spoken of in the Bible. In some cases its advocates will contend that the destruction of Jerusalem is the great day of judgment; in other cases they will aver that the whole Christian dispensation is meant. With them the chief objection to the doctrine of a judgment beyond death, and the resurrection, seems to be that such a judgment would be useless, and even pernicious in its tendency. But here I must insist that it would be much more profitable to search the Scriptures in order to find whether God has said that such a judgment shall actually take place, rather than to spend time in speculation about what use the Almighty will have for a future judgment, or in trying to show that the influence of the doctrine is bad. If God has directly declared that he will judge the world beyond the grave, we may rest assured that he has some use for such judgment; and if the doctrine is true, its tendency cannot be bad. It is objected that the doctrine of a judgment in the future offers greater license to evil doers. Mr. Williamson says: "Parents could never maintain family government by teaching their children, that they would reckon with them at the age of forty, and reward or punish them at a subsequent period. No civil government could exist and maintain its laws for a single year, by acting upon the principle that it would only for the present look on and mark down crimes to be punished twenty years from date." But the author ought to remember that Orthodoxy believes in a present judgment as much

as does Universalism. Nobody denies that "He is a God that judgeth in the earth;" nor that "The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." All can see that wicked men do undergo a certain amount of suffering in this life on account of their wickedness; there is no dispute in regard to this, and this present punishment is just as fearful to me, and as effectual in preventing vice, as it can be to a Universalist. And when it is remembered that, in addition to this, orthodox Christians look for a judgment and an eternity of punishment at the close of this short life, it is quite easy to see who will be most deterred from sin. The same author thinks that a future judgment would be unjust, because it would be transporting men to another world for trial. I give the following choice quotation: "If I remember aright, one of the grievances set forth in the declaration of American Independence was, that citizens of the colonies were taken across the waters to a distant land to be tried for offenses committed here. Now every American citizen is ready to condemn such a procedure, and will denounce the British government as unjust, oppressive, and tyrannical in so doing; and yet the great mass of them worship a God who transports men to another world, to be tried and judged for crimes committed in this, and in him they call it justice. I indulge a hope that the time is not far distant when men will discover that injustice and tyranny, though in a God, would be injustice and tyranny still." This is a fair sample of the foolish quibbling employed to destroy in men the fear of future punishment. Again, Mr. Williamson has forgotten that God's ways are not man's ways. He certainly exhibits a sublime faith in that Divine goodness and justice of which he so eloquently speaks, to suppose that God will not do him justice unless he tries him at the time and place of his crime. Indeed, one would think that some Universalists would be glad to get a "change of venue" to some other clime!

I do not suppose that the judgment will be a court of inquiry, for God, who sees the actions of all men at all times, does not need to institute such a court. As to the precise use of the future judgment, I am no more obliged to give an an-

swer than is my Universalist friend; yet an explanation which is quite common, is sufficient for me. Every soul at death, is prepared either for happiness or misery, according to its character of holiness or unholiness; and each immediately enters upon that state for which its previous character has fitted it. But it is true that no man in this short life can see the entire results of his deeds; for as the stone dropped in the midst of the placid lake, produces a circling wave which, ever widening, is never lost, but impresses itself upon every ripple it meets, until silently and imperceptibly it strikes upon the far distant shore, so each little wave of influence, whether good or evil, will continue to extend, and still extend, widening, deepening, as it rides over the rough billows of time, until it beats upon the far-off shores of eternity. And it has pleased our Father that when earth life is no more, when the accumulated results of all the actions of all men have been seen and recorded, when he shall have brought to life all of Adam's sleeping posterity—it has pleased him that in the body all men may behold the deeds done in that body to their ultimate effects; that the world's history may be revealed in its most minute details, it may be, to an assembled universe, and that the just and the unjust may declare the righteousness of the Judge, and receive their sentence of everlasting bliss or eternal woe.

Let us now examine the evidence of a judgment after death. Paul, in preaching to the Athenians concerning their idolatry, concludes as follows: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." (Acts xvii. 30, 31.) This language cannot refer to the Christian dispensation, because, although this was then in progress, Paul declared the "day" of judgment to be yet future. He did not say, "God hath appointed a day (i. e., the whole dispensation) in the which he is judging the world," but "a day in the which he will judge the world." Again, "the world" means the whole human family; and millions of the human family were in their graves before the Christian dispensation began, so that any judgment then

taking place, or which should in the future take place, would be to them a judgment after death.

Neither can this text refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, unless, indeed, Universalism can make it appear that every man, woman, and child then upon the earth, as well as the innumerable hosts who had died before that time, and the countless multitudes yet unborn, were all assembled at Jerusalem before the judgment seat of Titus, to be judged in "righteousness;" for "the world" was to be judged. Further, if the supposition be correct, Paul simply told the Athenians, "God commands all men everywhere to repent, because in the year 70 he intends to destroy Jerusalem!" What remorse of conscience, and what a general revival meeting it must have produced among those Athenians to learn that, in about fifteen years, there would be a trouble between the Jews and Romans away off down at Jerusalem! Finally, we conclude that, since the world will be judged in a single day, that day must be after the end of the world; otherwise all the race of man cannot be present.

Felix, the Roman governor, sent for Paul, and heard him concerning his faith in Christ; "And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled." (Acts xxiv. 25.) Evidently Paul had never heard that judgment meant the Christian dispensation; for, although that dispensation had been in progress nearly thirty years, he yet spoke of it as judgment to come in the future. It is equally certain that Paul did not mean the destruction of Jerusalem; for, if so, why should Felix tremble? Felix was a Roman, and, instead of being so greatly alarmed, he would, no doubt, have been quite well pleased to learn that in about ten years his own countrymen would conquer Jerusalem. Felix treated the matter just as men have ever been doing, when a judgment to come has been preached to them; he trembled, and answered, "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee."

Christ said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John xii. 48.) This text tells us precisely the time of the judg-

ment; it is at the last day. But when is that? Let Universalism answer. They quote as one of their strong proof-texts, John vi. 39: "And this is the Father's will which sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Here they claim that "the last day" (*te eschate hemera*) refers to the resurrection. In this they are quite right; and they ought to admit that the very same expression which occurs in the former text refers to the same time. Then, upon the resurrection day those who reject Christ, and receive not his words, will be judged.

Let us now examine a familiar passage over which Universalists have puzzled themselves not a little: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. ix. 27, 28.) All the defenders of Universalism, as far as I can learn, give the same exposition of this text. They maintain that the Greek words, *tois anthropois*, which are here translated "men," ought to be rendered "the men," or "these men," and that reference is had to the Jewish high priests, who, they claim, died a typical death in the holiest of holies, and then came forth to judge the people. But it is remarkably strange that Universalists have never yet referred to a single text in which these words are translated "the men" or "these men," referring to a particular class of men. This warrants me in believing that such a text cannot be found. By a little search I have discovered fourteen passages in the Greek Testament in which these words are translated "men," as in the one under consideration; and I doubt not there are others. In each of these texts some form of the word *anthropos*, with its article, is used to express the human family as a class; and in some of them it is quite certain that the whole race of mankind is meant. As an example, "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men (*hoi anthropoi*) shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." (Matt. xii. 36.) All will agree that Jesus meant to teach that all the idle words spoken by all men, should be taken into account at the day of judgment. Therefore, we will not allow Universalists the privilege of translating *tois anthropois*,

"these men," in this one single text just because they must have it that way in order to prevent the overthrow of their doctrine. If we should read the passage, "It is appointed unto all men once to die," etc., we would have the true meaning.

Again, the "men" of the text cannot mean the high priests, for while it was appointed unto "men" once to die, the high priest died every year. Perhaps some of them went into the *sanctum sanctorum* each year for fifty years, thus dying fifty times instead of once.

Further, if a typical death is meant in the text, then *tois anthropois* means the animals that were sacrificed, for their death typified the death of Christ; they were the men unto whom it was appointed "once to die."

Besides, it is clear from the connection that the entering of the high priest into the most holy place typified, not the death of Christ, but exactly the opposite; it typified the entering of Christ "into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (See verse 24.) And thus is it made certain that the death spoken of in the text is literal, and that the "men" referred to means the whole human race. Now, after this comes the judgment. What need have we of further testimony?

Yet again we will hear the words of the Saviour: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell. . . . But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee." (Matt. xi. 21, 24.)

This direct and emphatic language of the Saviour must forever defy the sophistry of Universalism. It is here directly stated that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, and Sodom should be judged with the cities which he was then addressing. The inhabitants of the former cities had been in their graves hundreds of years, yet Jesus declared that they should

meet and be compared with the inhabitants of the latter cities in a judgment which was yet future. How could this occur at any period except at the resurrection? I expect to wait throughout eternity for an answer.

Let the Saviour again be heard: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas: and behold a greater than Jonas is here. The queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it," etc. (Matt. xii. 41, 42.) When these words were spoken, the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South had been in their graves nine or ten centuries, yet Jesus told the Jews that they should "rise up" in the judgment with the generation then living. Did this occur at the destruction of Jerusalem? Do Universalists expect that Ninevites will rise up at any time during the Christian dispensation? The word translated "shall rise up," is *egerthesetai*. Now, if the reader will turn to 1 Cor. xv. 52, "And the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed," he will at once recognize a text which all Universalists claim has reference to the literal resurrection; but he will notice, also, that "shall be raised," in the latter passage, is translated from the very same word, and both expressions must refer to the same time. So we have it established, that in the literal resurrection of the literal dead, the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South shall stand in judgment with the generation upon the earth at the time of Christ; and, further, that the former shall condemn that generation. Is this a resurrection to holiness and happiness? If any reader can yet believe that there is no judgment taught in the Scriptures, except the destruction of Jerusalem and the Christian dispensation, I must pronounce him incorrigible, and leave him to examine the remainder of the scripture testimony at his leisure, trusting that in the meantime he will follow me through my next argument.

My seventh direct argument against Universalism is this: *The Scriptures do teach that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless.*

1. This punishment is shown to be endless, from the fact

that its duration is defined by the very strongest terms in the language, and the same which are applied to the duration of the happiness of the righteous, and to the attributes of God. These terms are the English words "eternal," "everlasting," "forever," "forever and ever," etc. To avoid the difficulty, some Universalists have argued that these terms do not express duration at all when applied to the "life" or "death" of the soul. A certain writer says: "Moral or spiritual life is the life of God in the soul, and it is called in the Scriptures 'eternal,' to signify its nature, rather than its duration." He thinks that this word does not express duration, because he supposes that many persons, after being quickened into spiritual life, fall away and become again dead in trespasses and sins. So he supposes that the word only expresses the "nature" of the life. (And by this I presume he means the intensity of the life.) Believers in total apostasy may dispose of this gentleman as they choose; from my standpoint there is no difficulty.

The Scriptures speak of "eternal" salvation, "eternal" damnation, "eternal" power, an "eternal" house, "eternal" judgment, "eternal" fire, an "eternal" inheritance, an "eternal" God, etc. Now these various subjects, salvation, damnation, power, house, judgment, fire, inheritance, and God, can have nothing in common except the simple element of duration. In what do eternal salvation and eternal damnation agree except in duration? Compare an eternal house with an eternal fire: what have they in common except that they endure, that is, possess the element of time, duration?

Others hold that these terms do express a duration when applied to punishment, but not an endless duration. They suppose it to mean the period of a man's life, or simply an indefinitely long time. It is quite true that they do not always express an endless duration. The priesthood of Aaron was, I believe, called an "everlasting" priesthood; Canaan was an "everlasting" possession, etc. Taking advantage of this fact, Universalists have labored to make the terms appear entirely ambiguous, and to destroy all confidence in their signification. But there is a principle of interpretation which, if they would only heed it, would remove all the difficulty:

"eternal," "everlasting," "forever," and "forever and ever," express the longest duration which, in the nature of the case, can be applied to their subjects. By this principle, we will readily understand that the "everlasting" priesthood endured until the end of the Jewish dispensation; the "everlasting" hills will endure until the end of time, etc. And by the same principle, the "everlasting," "eternal" happiness or misery of the soul will continue as long as the soul continues to exist; and the "everlasting" righteousness of God will endure as long as Jehovah shall exist. If Universalists insist that the terms are ambiguous, without any principle to guide us in their application, then I insist that the "everlasting" righteousness of God may come to an end; that God may become righteous, and that the "eternal" God may cease to exist at any time, for certainly he has already existed "an indefinitely long time." Again, David tells us twenty-six times in one psalm that "His mercy endureth forever." (Psalms cxxxvi.) But, if "forever" is so unsettled in its meaning, then after all that David, with the other inspired writers, has said about it, and after all that Universalists have told us concerning the mercy of God, which will not allow him to punish a soul in the future life; after all this, God's mercy may at some day come to an end, and Universalists may be "turned into hell with all the nations that forget God."

The foregoing shows that the principle of interpretation already stated is correct, and that when applied to subjects which are, in the nature of things, capable of an endless existence, such as the attributes of God, and the human soul, the words referred to do express an endless duration. It must not be forgotten that these same words, "eternal," "everlasting," etc., are applied to the happiness of the righteous as well as the misery of the wicked.

Let us now compare a few texts.

"And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren," etc., "for my name's sake, shall inherit everlasting life." (Matt. xix. 29.) Here "everlasting" is applied to the happiness of the righteous. Behold the other side of the picture: "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God," etc., "who shall be punished with everlasting destruc-

tion from the presence of the Lord." (2 Thess. i. 8, 9.) In this passage the same word, "everlasting," is applied to the misery of the wicked. But hear again: "Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents," etc., "who shall not receive manifold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting. (Luke xviii. 29, 30.) On the other hand: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv. 46.)

It should be noticed that the words everlasting and eternal are translated from the same word in the original, and express precisely the same duration. This passage would be just as correct if rendered, "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." I would be thankful if some skilful Universalist would point out the exact difference in the duration of "punishment" and "life" as used in this text. Let us compare again: "But now being made free from sin, and become servants of God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." (Rom. vi. 22.) On the other hand: "It is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire." (Matt. xviii. 8.)

This is sufficient upon the word everlasting. Now observe the use of the word eternal. "And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." (Heb. v. 9.) "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." (Mark iii. 29.)

Lastly, we will compare some texts in which the phrase "forever and ever" is used. "And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." (Dan. xii. 3.) "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." (Rev. xiv. 11.) Once more: "And there shall be no night there; . . . and they shall reign forever and ever." (Rev. xxii. 5.) "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, . . . and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." (Rev. xx. 10.) Now, there is the strongest possible reason for believing that these terms do express an endless duration;

and by the foregoing comparison of texts, we have found that the duration of the happiness of the righteous is exactly equal to the duration of the misery of the wicked; for both are defined by the same terms, used in the same connections, applied to the same subjects, at the same times—there can be no difference. If everlasting life is endless, then is the everlasting destruction, everlasting punishment, and everlasting fire, mentioned in the texts, also endless. If eternal salvation is endless, then is eternal damnation also endless. If “forever and ever” expresses an endless duration when applied to the souls of the righteous, all must admit that it expresses the same thing when applied to the souls of the wicked.

If Universalism can get rid of endless punishment, it will at the same time get rid of endless happiness, and an endless God.

2. The punishment of the wicked is declared to be endless in a number of negative expressions, the same which are used to express the duration of the reward of holiness and the attributes of God. “He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” (John iii. 36.) But Universalism flatly contradicts this scripture, by teaching that he that believeth not the Son shall see life, if not immediately after death, at the farthest, after a short purgatory; they affirm that the wrath of God does not abide or remain upon the unbeliever.

Christ declared, “Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.” (Matt. xii. 32.) Here are certain characters represented whose sin shall not be forgiven, neither in this life, nor in the life to come. If forgiveness means the removal of punishment, that punishment will never be removed; but if, as Universalists contend, forgiveness means the removal of the practice of sinning, still that practice will never be removed; these characters will always continue to commit sin, consequently, can never be happy. Any possible construction is fatal to Universalism. Give heed again to the words of the Master: “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it were better for thee to enter into

life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." (Mark ix. 43, 44.) If Universalists will not admit that these strong negative expressions have reference to an endless duration, then they must agree with me that the blissful "inheritance that fadeth not away," may endure no longer than the "everlasting" inheritance of the Jews. The Psalmist says of God, "Thy years shall have no end;" yet, according to the Universalist method of expressing duration, Jehovah may cease to exist at any day.

Universalists take much pains to show that there is no such place or condition as a future hell. They maintain that the words translated "hell," mean only the valley of Hinnom, the grave, and I know not what else.

Christ threatened the Scribes and Pharisees, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell." (Matt. xxiii. 33.) Mr. Skinner, with all other advocates of the "faith," aver that *gehenna*, here rendered "hell," means nothing more than the valley of Hinnom. Let us see with what reason. Christ would not, of course, threaten the Jews with a danger to which they were not exposed; yet how could they be in danger of the valley of Hinnom? Did Christ or the disciples intend to throw them into this valley? It is well known that this matter belonged exclusively to the civil authority, to these same Scribes and Pharisees whom he addressed; and how idle it would have been to have threatened them with a punishment which they themselves alone had the right to inflict! Further, Christ taught his disciples, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. x. 28.) Our Saviour here admonishes his disciples to fear not men, since they are able to kill the body alone, but he shows them, further, that there is one who is able to destroy the soul also; him must they fear. Universalists, I believe, argue that the soul here spoken of means the animal life. But it seems perfect nonsense to speak of the animal life as something separate and distinct from the body, and as being capable of an independent ex-

istence. Men are able to destroy the animal life of their own species in the same way that they are able to destroy the animal life of the swine and oxen which they kill for food. To the same effect is the language of the Saviour, as recorded in Luke: "And I say unto you my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell (*gehenna*); yea, I say unto you, fear him." (Luke xii. 4, 5.) So it appears that this hell, or *gehenna*, is something which is to be feared after the death of the body; and that is all for which I contend. Universalists, at the very least, must admit that the disciples were commanded to fear one who, after the death of the body, had power to cast the "animal life" into the valley of Hinnom. And if this valley near Jerusalem is all the hell mentioned in the Scriptures, it is, at least, a place of which the souls or "animal lives" of men are in danger after death.

I presume it is true that *gehenna* originally meant the valley of Hinnom merely, and so also paradise (*paradeisos*) meant a park or pleasure grounds, and was applied to the Garden of Eden. So, if we contend that Jesus meant to teach his disciples that after death men were in danger of the valley of Hinnom, we may as well say that when he declared, "To-day thou shalt be with me in paradise," he merely meant to tell the repentant thief, "To-day thou shalt be with me in the Garden of Eden!"

We find there are the very strongest reasons for believing that the word hell, as used in the Scriptures, in many cases, at least, has reference to a future punishment; but suppose we admit that hell never means more than the valley of Hinnom, the destruction of Jerusalem, the grave, or the stings of conscience; what has orthodoxy lost by the admission? It has already been shown by the most positive declarations of God's word, that there will be a future, endless punishment for the wicked, enduring as long as the happiness of the righteous, and even as long as the existence of the soul, or the existence of God. Now, if the word hell has reference only to something seen or felt in this life, then orthodoxy has

made a mistake in applying this word to the future punishment taught in the Scriptures. But what of that? A mistake in the use of a word will not affect the truth of the Scriptures. If hell is not the proper name for future punishment, then it remains for Universalists to coin for us a word which does express the teaching of the Bible upon this point; for it certainly is very uncharitable in them to labor so hard to show us that we are using the wrong word, and yet refuse to furnish us with a better word.

My eighth direct argument against Universalism is, *That the Scriptures everywhere teach that happiness in the future life is conditional.*

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." (Rev. ii. 7.) The unavoidable inference is that to him that overcometh not, it shall not be given to eat of the tree of life. But how many will overcome the world? John answers the question thus: "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Again, "Who is he that evercometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (1 John v. 4, 5.) So it is established that those who are born of God are they who shall overcome, and that their faith is the means of this victory. All are not born of God, all have not this faith; hence, all will not overcome, and all will not "eat of the tree of life that is in the midst of the paradise of God." The "paradise of God," here spoken of, can mean nothing less than the upper world, the resting place of the saints; hence all will not be made holy and happy in heaven. In the same connection it is said, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." (Rev. ii. 10.) This can mean nothing else than that those who are not faithful unto death, shall not receive a crown of life. And none save those born of God can be faithful, and none others can receive this crown of life.

"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." (Rev. xiv. 13.) Dying in the Lord is given as the cause of the blessedness of

those dying thus; and it follows that those who do not die in the Lord are not blessed. If those dying in the Lord rest from their labor, those not dying in the Lord do not rest from their labor. If it were necessary, there would be no difficulty in showing that all men do not die in the Lord. Christ declared to some, "Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins." (John viii. 21.)

In keeping with the foregoing is the following: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev xxii. 14.) Universalists will not pretend that all men "do his commandments;" yet nothing can be plainer than that, as doing his commandments gives the right to the tree of life, and the right to enter into the city, the refusal to do his commandments excludes men from the same.

"But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." (Matt. xxiv. 13.) "For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end." (Heb. iii. 14.)

As a ninth direct argument against Universalism, I will call attention to the fact, *That salvation in the future world depends upon faith in Christ.*

In offering this, I do not overlook the fact that God requires the use of means to salvation only from those who can comply with such means, or only to the degree which they can employ means; and thus infants and idiots are saved without faith, and the heathen is saved, in his ignorance of revelation, by what small degree of faith he is able to exercise as a result of the faint light which comes to his understanding. But God requires this means or preparation of faith from all who have his law, at least. He who reads God's word may find that to him, at least, is addressed the admonition, "He that believeth not, shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.)

Upon another occasion the Saviour said: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John xii. 48.) This text was quoted to prove

a general judgment, and now we perceive that it is, because they reject Christ and receive not his words; it is because of unbelief that the persons spoken of shall be judged in the last day. Of course, neither infants nor heathen can reject Christ, because they have never learned of him; but those having been enlightened in respect to him, in order to receive the benefits of the salvation which he has prepared.

In conclusion, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii. 36.) This is conclusive: he that believeth not the Son shall not—shall never see life. All agree that there are many human beings who reject Christ, who have neither that intimate and personal faith which enables them to hold vital communion with him, nor indeed so much as the faith of devils, whereby they are caused to tremble; and, according to any reasonable interpretation of the texts quoted, such men cannot be saved in the future life. And since Universalism teaches that all men without distinction of faith or works, shall be saved beyond the resurrection, Universalism is again shown to be false.

In presenting the foregoing nine direct arguments against Universalism, I have adduced in support of each but a small part of the evidence which is furnished in the Holy Scriptures; but one conclusive text, one unanswerable argument is as good as a score; and those passages quoted have seemed to me clear and emphatic in their application to the points in question. If the perusal of these pages shall ever aid a fellow-being to a more correct understanding of God's plan of salvation, if these considerations shall ever cause a human soul to seek a higher and purer life, and the approval of a righteous Judge, I shall be abundantly repaid for writing.

ART. III.—*Theanthropos: The God-Man.—No. I.*

THIS name suggests the existence of a being who, in personal identity, possesses three distinct natures, and three separate and absolute lives; yet two of these natures and lives are wholly dependent on the other. The first personality in his being is absolute and perfect divinity; the second is absolute and perfect humanity; the third is an absolute and perfect animal nature and organism. The two spirit natures, divine and human, may be so united in the third, or animal organism, as to constitute but one being—*The God-Man*. This union depends upon the fact that two of these natures and personal identities are spirit, and nothing but spirit, in being and life, and that one is a dependent spirit in its being and its life; and that the third may be a perfect animal or material organism, having a material life capable of serving as a living tabernacle or earthly house, in which the spiritual union may abide.

Spirit may communicate with spirit; thus, two and even three spirits may harmonize in one being, and yet each have a separate and personal identity. Such is the Godhead, as it is revealed to us in the Scriptures—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. These personalities are all spirit, and are revealed to us as constituting one God, and his name one. We, therefore, find the name God used in the Bible to represent the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. God, therefore, is, and of necessity must be, a spirit in his being and powers of life.

These spiritual personalities are, therefore, to be regarded as equal in all their essential attributes of being and character. They are divine and infinite in every property of being and nature; yet the Son and the Spirit, in their personal identity, proceeded from and are dependent upon the Father. They are the appointed agencies by whom, and through whom, he has chosen to accomplish all the purposes of his sovereign will. Where one is, there the other must be, in all

the power of will and knowledge. Their thoughts, feelings, and desires are one. They are at the same time and place, alike present, and harmonize with the Father in all his plans and purposes. Thus, through them, the Father's will is ever developed in all the actions and stirring energies of divine life. It is the Father who is the origin of all being and life. He alone hath immortality—dwelling in him as an absolute and independent property of being. Hence we read (1 Tim. vi. 15, 16,) that it is a part of the work of Christ Jesus, the God-Man, to show forth to the world him "who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting." The Scriptures are replete with the proofs given by the inspiration of God, as to the personal identity and work of our Lord Jesus Christ; and also of the Holy Spirit. In the first chapter of this epistle (1 Timothy), and in the seventeenth verse, we have an ascription given to the Father in personal identity alone. "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen." Then again, in the second chapter, beginning at the fifth verse, we read, "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." It is of this man, and of his identity as a man, and as God, that we desire to reason, and to write, "Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." Now, as the Spirit has testified of him, and has expressly told us that God was manifested in the flesh (of man)—"Justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory;" we must believe the record that God, the Father, has given of Christ, his Son, because no father can give and express the personal identity of a son, differing in the conscious identity of being from that of his own, in any clearer manner, or in stronger terms, than that which is given of Christ, as the Son of God, in the Bible. Yet we are assured that the life of God was not only in him, but that the presence of the Father was made visible by him and through

him. Of his agency in the accomplishment of all the plans and purposes of the Father, and in the full development of his will, the Scriptures do most fully and clearly testify. To a brief collation made from the many evidences given in the word of God, with respect to the agency of Christ, the God-Man, we now would call special attention. We, in this presentation of evidences, design to show, not only that the presence of the Father's being is manifested in the identity of the Son, but to settle, as far as it is possible for us to do, at once and forever, the idea of his real and perfect manhood, by the record which the Father has given to the world of the God-Man, Christ Jesus. We design, also, to show that Christ is the special agent of the Father in the following particular works: First, in the work of absolute creation, and in the transmission of being and life to mankind, as a rational and intelligent family, bearing his own image and made after his own likeness. Second, in teaching mankind their origin, and their duty to God, as a Father. Third, to fully reveal to them the being and character of the Father, that they might be able to know him, and, in knowing, might be able to glorify and enjoy him forever. This being the "chief end" for which man was created and developed in being and life, we will not now speak of any other particulars in which the agency of Christ is presented in the Scriptures.

The first passage in the testimony of God, the Father, respecting the being and character of his Son, which we present, is John i. 1-5: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not."

"The same was in the beginning with God." This text suggests an inquiry of no little worth to the inquiring mind. Was the God-Man possessed of a conscious idea of his own personal identity as man, at the time to which this Scripture refers? We apprehend but one intelligent answer to this question, and that may be found in the following words of

Christ himself (John xvii. 5), "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Again, in the twenty-fourth verse, he says in the most positive terms, "For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." He did, therefore, have a perfect knowledge of his then present being and manner of life before all worlds existed; before any other being was developed. He knew the Father before the foundation of the world, and the Father knew him, as the Son of his love. In his then present state of being, in all the stirring energies of his then present personal identity and life, he was present with the Father, and was in every shade of his Sonship recognized by the Father. He saith, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" What does this word "before" mean, if he did not, as the Son of man, dwell in the bosom of the Father before he was born of the virgin Mary, in the city of Bethlehem? He did exist, and recognized his identity, before he was thus manifested to mankind in a body of flesh. We cannot believe that he ever made a false impression upon the mind of any being, living or dead; nor did he make statements respecting himself that were not absolutely true facts, as they were stated by him; yet we read in John viii. 56-59: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it and was glad. Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am. Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, passing through the midst of them, and so passed by." He was then in a body of flesh and bones, with blood for the life of his flesh. His birth, as the son of Mary, was known to all who were present. He was recognized by them as a man not yet fifty years old, yet he, by a power existing in himself, hid himself from their eyes in the temple, and in this invisible state passed out of the temple and away from them; thus proving that, as a man, he could exist and be all that he ever was in an invisible state. "But to us," says the apostle (1 Cor. viii. 6), "there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him;

and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Therefore, we are to believe and recognize "none other God but one;" the one living God, which made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein. "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

In Paul's epistle to the Colossians (i. 15-19), the personal and separate identity of the one God-Man, and his personal agency in the work of creation, are recognized in the most absolute manner that is within the power of language to express. In the fifteenth verse, we have the character of his being, and the priority of his existence, given in the most unmistakable terms: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist; and he is the head of the body, the Church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." Yea, "the fullness of the Godhead bodily" was in him. In him, and by him, the invisible God, the everlasting Father, was made manifest. This was no small part of the work committed to him, as the Father's perfect and only representative. Being in the form (or image) of the invisible God, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, even though he was found to be in fashion or habit as a man, because, in his personal identity of being and life, he did possess perfect equality with the Father, in substance, as a spirit, and in divine perfections and power. He, therefore, said, "I and my Father are one;" "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." The Father, also, in addressing the Son, said (Heb. i. 8-12): "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation

of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." I will make thine enemies thy footstool, is a work to be carried on by the Father, through agencies of his own choosing. He is to rule in the midst of enemies. In the scripture, as quoted above, we have, however, the Father's acknowledgment of his personal divinity and identity as God, and of his character and authority as a King. Then an open declaration of his works as Creator is made. His equality with the Father in the perfect immortality of his being and life, as well as in the unchangeableness of his person and character, is given. If there was nothing more said in the Bible on the subject of his absolute divinity, and of his identity in perfect manhood, we suppose what has been referred to is abundantly sufficient to establish these facts beyond the possibility of a doubt.

As to his being the Father's representative and agent in the work of creation, and of the revelation of himself to mankind as his offspring, we wish to give some further testimony. Some of the scriptures to which reference will be made, are also full of evidence respecting the personality of Christ in human nature, as the representative and perfect prototype of Adam, he being the *protoplast* and progenitor of all mankind, not even excepting Eve, the developing agent and mother of God's offspring, as they existed in the dualistic being and life of man. The name man is not a proverb, an enigma in a name, given as a scientific problem to be solved only by the worldly-wise men of the day. It is a name given by one who knew the depth and height of its meaning, even by the God-Man, who, being a man as well as God revealed through man, did fully understand the being and nature of man in every shade of his personal identity and character. Were I called upon to analyze this name, and to give the distinctive properties of that being to whom it was first given as an appellation, I would be compelled to seek for information in the Scriptures. Therein Man has, through a Divine Providence, revealed himself to man, and, in doing so, has

manifested to man the wonder-working power of a Triune Godhead. It is by, and through, Theanthropos, the God-Man, that the man Adam was made able to identify his own being in life, as distinguished from any other creature by which he was surrounded. In that power, given to identify himself, he found the means through which he was able to identify his Creator—THE LORD GOD OF LIFE. Therefore, we say that there is not only a loving, but a living design, and an equitable reason why, manifested in all the plans and purposes conceived in the living Father's heart, wherein the foundation was laid for a great family of intelligent beings, who should be in the image and after the likeness of God the Son. Were I asked a thousand times for the loving and living design that prompted the Godhead to the production of the means by, and through, which the work of this grand development of being and life was accomplished, I would be forced by necessity to answer in the language of the excellent catechism of our Church. Surely the chief end had in view, the loving, the yet living, and ever-living design of the Father was, that man should be able to glorify and enjoy the society, the presence, the companionship of God forever. This being the design of God, and the chief end to be attained by man, amid all the stirring energies of life, there could be no higher purpose ever conceived, that life could enjoy, or that could in any manner be interrupted by sin. Sin being introduced, did not, for it could not, destroy the plans and purposes of the Father. God's intermedial agent was there. His plans and establishing purposes relative to the being and life of this great family were well secured. This *intermedium* was man's *instaromnium*. He was, indeed, like all; he was an example, a pattern for all God's family. In this character, he was a suitable companion for God himself and for man. He was, then, in the identity of his being, both God and men. He must be a wise, a divine agent, to be able to do divine works, and to represent and reveal a divine Father. He was, indeed, the "one mediator between God and man," who, by his bright intermication, became the propitiation—a human as well as a divine covering for the sins of man. He was, by the Father, developed to be a suit-

able companion and teacher. He must in some way have a visible body through which, and by which, to manifest himself to the mind and visible organism of man. Therefore, we read in Genesis, that, after making all that could be necessary in any way for the comfort of man's outward or animal being and nature of life, and in providing for the necessities of man as a being of earth, he so arranged these provisions as to make everything to become a suggestive agency to the human nature, the inward and immaterial man, whose being and life are not to be identified by creation, but by the power of divine transmission. God then said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." What a reason for a name! The name is here to be regarded as an appellative, and stands for a whole class or species. It is a generic name, and denominates every member of a specified race. This name is to extend in its analysis so as to include in it an earthly house, a living tabernacle, a vassal. It means, also, a human being, of spirit-nature and life. Thus it is that the name man is so very closely allied to that of Adam, which involves the idea of image, likeness, similitude. It expresses, also, manner of being, life, look, and that which rises up, or stretches out, not only in figure or form, but in being and manner of life. Therefore, we read in Genesis v. 1, 2: "This is the book of the generations of Adam." Here is the idea given of extended generations in the name. "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female made he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created." The true idea, as here given, is not hard to understand after a careful comparison of what God has revealed. In the first verse we read, "In the day that God created man," in his image, he was produced. We read in the first chapter, twenty-seventh verse, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Therefore, "In the likeness of God made he him." In the second verse, fifth chapter, "God blessed them," but not as man and woman, but as male and female, because the woman was not a developed identity in personal being at the time man was created in the

image and after the likeness of God. Her development was an after work. The woman's being and life was not perfectly given by creation, but by transmission and perfect development. Therefore, the man who was called Adam, in the day that God created and developed his identity, in being and life, was the woman's progenitor. He was made her representative in life as well as in being. This, however, will be more fully noticed in another place.

We have here introduced the facts relative to the woman's being and life as existing in Adam, in an undeveloped state, for the purpose of showing how man existed in his human nature, in Christ, before any act of creative development was put forth by Christ as the Creator; and to show that man's life was really and fully represented by Christ before man had any developed identity at all. We must remember, however, that there can be no development of that which does not exist previous to the developing work. If, therefore, the Father, in his own plans and purposes, designed to work by the hands of a developing agent, that agency must have existed in himself, and have been developed by himself. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that there was a God-Man, a Christ, existing in the Father, and with the Father, before the world was. Hence we read in his own words, "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." A fountain may produce and send forth a stream that is in itself equal in all its parts of being with the fountain from which it flows. No fountain, however, can produce that which does not previously exist, in nature and quality of character, in itself. God is the fountain of a perfect immortality. He is the author of all being and life; and, as no stream can rise above its source, so nothing can be produced that is above God, for he is above all; he is the "Lord God of gods," and above all that is called god. We, therefore, read in Ephesians iv. 6, that there is "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." We are, therefore, "his offspring." To every one of his great family there is, therefore, given grace, beauty, favor, "according to the gift of Christ." Because of this, Jesus says (John xv. 9):

"As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love;" "That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," (See Rom. xv. 6.) Now that Jesus had a personal knowledge of his origin and identity, see John xiii. 3, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God." He humbled himself and manifested to his disciples that he was of the Father appointed an agent in their cleansing. He, in John vi. 57, acknowledged himself subject to, and also dependent upon, the Father for life: "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." He, therefore, is the Father's agent in giving life to every member of God's great family; "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also because he is the Son of man." His home, his dwelling place, is in the Father's bosom. He gives to the world the idea, in the strongest terms, that he can do nothing, however, in opposition to, and nothing without the concurrence of, his Father's will. "I am come in my Father's name: the works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me;" although in all these works, he was as a perfect fiduciary agent, under the control of the Father's will, to be manifested to the eyes of men in the body and flesh of an infant child. He was in personal identity by the Father appointed to be the representative of an undeveloped family, who should bear his own image, and wear his own likeness. He, therefore, in a body of flesh, made immortal, lived and was truly identified through every stage of man's being in the presence of man. This was the purpose, the well understood design of the Father, when he, the Christ, was by the Father foreordained before the foundation of the world, to do the works of *the Him* that sent him out into life and being from himself. He was truly ordained to be the first, the head of this great family. He was, therefore, to have the pre-eminence. (See Col. i. 18, 19.) "And he is the head of the body, the Church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have

the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father, that in him, should all fullness dwell." Divinity does certainly understand himself. Divinity cannot die; it is he who is, in himself, and of himself, immortal in all the principles of being and life. Divinity has the power to transmit to other existences, produced by his own power, all the principles and powers of immortality; but Divinity cannot cease to be immortal in every shade of being and character. Divinity is life, and giveth life, and the power of life. Divinity may send out a stream of life that is in being possessed of a character like himself. This may run on and on forever, in a channel below him; but no fountain can produce of itself a stream which rises in its onward flowing above itself. A being of divine nature may produce human nature, for both are spirit in their being and existence of life: both may be equally perfect. They may, therefore, dwell together and have perfect fellowship, one with the other. Thus united, the divine can give life, energy, and power to the human. As these are both immortal in being, and in existence of being, possessed with an immortality of life, God the Father, who is a divine spirit, can and does live in a being that is of human nature, no matter as to the habitation in which the human or soul being may be made to dwell. Perfection is the condition, and peace the result. The vessel may, indeed, be made of the earth, and have a material life and organization. It may cease to live and be dissolved; return to dust again, and thus await the pleasure of him who first contrived its mysterious economy. The body of Christ was, however, an immortal building from the hour of its first development. It could not see or be made subject to corruption. Its having been miraculously transmitted to and developed in the womb of the virgin Mary, as an "infant of days," did not change it to a mortal body; no, not for one hour. Christ, the God-Man, received his identity from God the Father, by the active principle which we call production, and by the law of transanimation, which powers and principles of power existed, and now exist, in the Father as absolute and necessary properties of his being. Without these he could not be possessed with all power. Christ, therefore, tells us in unmistakable

language of his origin. (See John vi. 38.) "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." Again, in the fortieth verse: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Again, I affirm that there can be no development made to angels or man of that which does not really exist. Therefore, Christ, in real manhood, did exist in heaven before he came down from heaven. As a proof of this we quote John vi. 62: "What, and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" Now, we have in Mark xvi. 19, the testimony that he did thus ascend: "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." We read again (John xvi. 28), "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father." "I came out from God," was a declaration made by Jesus of Nazareth on more occasions than one. In John viii. 42, we have his own language again recorded: "Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my words." In the forty-seventh verse we read, "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." But, in speaking to his disciples, as recorded in John xvi. 27, his words are very different: "For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God." Jesus the Christ was not self-produced, neither was he self-sent into the world. He was, indeed, the begotten of God, the only begotten of the Father. He was, indeed, full of grace and truth. We ask, did not Jesus of Nazareth, the man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, have a conscious knowledge of his own personal identity and origin, as a perfect man in heaven, before he was ever manifested in the flesh of an infant child to the men of this world? Who can read the scriptures already referred to, and doubt for one moment that he was with God, and

in God, and God in him, even before the foundation of the world?

But we will again refer to Christ's own declarations. (See John x. 33-38.) "The Jews answered him saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him."

How could that which did not exist in a known personal identity, in all the power of a recognized fact, be thus sanctified, set apart, foreordained, and sent down to the earth as a fiduciary agent to do the work of another? Who can believe that there was no Saviour; no real mediator between God and man, until Jesus of Nazareth was born in Bethlehem of Judea? There was a Christ even in the days of Moses. He did exist when the work of creative development began. "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

I will now refer to the facts before alluded to. The God-Man was born of the Father, developed by the Father, and by the Father sanctified and sealed. Therefore, Paul, in Heb. ii. 11, tells us, "For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one (that is, of one Father); for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." Therefore, we conclude that man, the whole family of man, even down to the latest son and daughter thereof, had a common origin with Jesus Christ of Nazareth—the Son of God, the Elder Brother. He proceeded forth, and came out from the Father, by the laws of transanimation, and power of transmission, which existed in the Father, as necessary properties of his being as God the Father, for all power and all authority belonged to and dwelt in him. Therefore, as the Son did, in all the principles of his Divine and human

nature, proceed from and come out of the Father, he is the head, and has the pre-eminence. To him, therefore, the Father gave immortality of being and life equal with himself. He also transmitted into his hands all power and all authority, both in heaven and upon earth. He, the Son of God, therefore, created all things that were created, even to the outward organism of the man Adam, and gave to him all the dualistic and dynamic qualities of animal being and life. This outward man, this material organism, received its earthly existence and perfect development, out of the dust of the ground, having material blood for its life. See again Gen. ix. 4-7. "But flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of every man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man." Here then, we are authorized to say that the outward man was made to be in the image of his Creator, the God-Man, in whose organized body of flesh and bones there was the blood of a material life, made immortal from its origin. He therefore was not subject to mortality. He could not be, in any way, subject to the corrupting power of sin. He could not be held by the power of death. His life could not be taken from him. Man, by eating of the tree of life, of which he was in the obedience of faith allowed to do in all freedom, could have secured the immortality of his outward being and life, and thus have been made as immortal as was the God-man himself. The life of the outward and less important organism of man, glorious and beautiful as it was, and may yet be made to exist, we must leave for the present by sin subdued, and under the curse of a present sentence of a certain, though suspended death, to return to the ground. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Thus the outward and visible man is doomed, in consequence of sin, to await the pleasure of him who said: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." "And the Lord

God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken." This man was of the earth, and was earthly, and only earthly. Not so, however, with the inward and invisible man. Human nature is of a higher origin. It is a living soul, a spiritual existence, of immortality by its birth of being. It too proceeded forth and came out from God the Creator, at the moment he breathed into the nostrils of the outward and visible man, this living tabernacle, the breath of life. Then it was that the human nature received its personal identity as a living soul. We have the idea fully established in the Bible, that Christ did receive from the Father life for every member of the great family; that he was made to represent, and raise up in the Father's name, and in his own image. Therefore, in the work of producing and qualifying his under agent, Adam, (our English Bibles say,) he breathed into the nostrils of the man that he had formed of the dust of the ground "the breath of life." But Hebrew scholars tell us that in the original it is given in the plural form: "The breath of lives." Thus Adam received life from God, in becoming a living soul, for every one of his posterity, not excepting the woman herself, who was taken out of man. Therefore, the order of being and life, in all the offspring of God, runs thus: God the Father transmitted being and life to Christ his Son, as a king and representative of all. He therefore lives by the Father, and as the Father's agent, received this plurality of lives—life for all the family of God. Thus it was then, all that lived in Adam, lived, and are to live by Christ; and their life was and is in him, and by him transmitted to Adam; and the man Adam became, in his own developed being, the dualistic and dynamic agent, through whom, and by whom, being and life to the body and soul of every member of his race was to be transmitted. The Son, the Creator, and the Father's transmitting agent, existing in the express image of his Father's person, and the brightness of his Father's glory, transmitted to Adam his own image,

and formed him after his own likeness. Therefore the offspring of Adam were to be in his image, and after his own likeness.

We might here close this article because of its present length, but justice and inclination forbid it. We therefore proceed to inquire into the fact of his having been seen, during the dispensation of angels, as an angel in the form of a man, by both patriarchs and prophets. Jacob, in speaking of the Coming One, said of him, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come." Jacob had an idea of his perfect manhood, and of his right to rule. We might inquire how he obtained this impression; but the inquiry would be hushed in a moment by the record given in Gen. xxxii., beginning with the twenty-fourth verse: "And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh; and he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with God and with man, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name; and he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Who but Theanthropos could this man have been? We read in Gen. xvi. that the angel of the Lord found Hagar by a fountain of water in the wilderness, and talked with her. Who was this angel of the Lord? If it was not the God-man, why is he styled the angel of the Lord? We answer, he was indeed the perfect and immortal manhood of Jesus, the Christ of God. (See Rev. i. 1.) "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he (Jesus Christ) sent and signified it by his angel, unto his servant John." This angel of Christ

the Lord, was none other than the true body and reasonable soul of Jesus of Nazareth, a man in every way approved of God. In proof of this, we quote the language of this angel as given in this chapter: "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending. The first and the last." "And when I saw him (that is, this angel, one like unto the Son of Man), I fell at his feet as dead. (This was John the beloved disciple, whose testimony is here given.) And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last; I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." This language can apply to no one spoken of in all the Scriptures, save to the perfect and immortal manhood of the Son of God; yes, to the God-Man it does and must refer. But again, as Christ was about to close this communication made to his servant John, he said, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star." Truly indeed it was the Christ, who also said unto Moses, Gen xxiii. 20: "Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared." Verse 23, "For mine angel shall go before thee." Again, in xxxii. 34, "Therefore now go lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee: behold mine angel shall go before thee." This was the angel that redeemed Jacob (see Gen. xlviii. 15, 16): "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." In Isaiah lxiii. 9, Christ is called the angel of God's presence, who saved the house of Israel (Jacob). He it was who, in love and pity, redeemed the people, and carried them all the days of old. "Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock." Christ says: "I am the good Shepherd." He did lead Israel as a flock, by the hand of Moses, and the angel of his presence was ever with him. Isaiah saw him as a man clothed in garments stained with blood, and inquired, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed

garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength?" The answer comes with all the authority given by the Father to the Son: "I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save." Then doubtless it is our duty and interest to remember the language of Isaiah ix. 5-8: "For every battle of the Lord is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be (and it was) with burning and fuel (the meat) of fire." How expressive is this language! In addition to the confused noise, and garments all stained with blood, the prophet saw the burning passions, the quenchless hatred, of those who with wicked hands should, during the earth life of Christ, lay hold on him, and in their bitter opposition, add to insult and causeless injury, the sadness of deep reproach and contempt; and last of all, the fuel of fire, a cross of wood, was by wicked hands prepared, and murderously used, for the purpose of destroying him whom Isaiah immediately describes as the subject of all this hatred and reproach: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." His victory is, however, to be a complete success. His enemies shall all perish. In the bitterness of their opposition and blindness, they will work out their own destruction with greediness, because "They walked after their own thoughts in a way that was not good." This Child cometh as a warrior to root out iniquity, to establish the works of righteousness, and to build up a people in the name of his Father—a people who shall be all righteous; "They shall inherit the earth forever."

THE INSTAROMNIUM.

We have seen that the grand purpose of God the Father, as developed in the manifested existence of God the Son, was the life, and the development in life, of a race of intelligent beings, to be, in God's nomenclature, denominated man. We have also seen that the grand design of man's being and character of life, was that he should "glorify God and enjoy

him forever." We have seen, and do believe, that God is as unchangeable in all his plans and purposes, as he is in his being and character. This race of beings were to exist in his image, and after his own likeness. Hence it is that we read in 1 Cor. viii. 6: "But to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Although there are many that are called gods, yet it is Christ only who knows the mind of the Father, for he is equal with him in all the essential attributes of his being and character of life. He alone, therefore, has been his counselor, his agent, and his true personal representative. Hence it is said in Rom. xi. 36, "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen."

Again, we read in 1 John iv. 9: "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." Therefore, we conclude that all the race of man, in all the extended generations of Adam, were, and are, dependent on God through him for being and for life. We have, therefore, seen him as he proceeded forth and came out from the Father, like all, standing for all, representing all. We have heard falling from his immortal lips, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." "For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." We have seen him, as he proceeded forth in his own personal identity, and came out from the bosom of God, possessing the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his Father's person; having in himself developed "the fullness of the Godhead bodily." We have heard him say, "I am come in my Father's name." We have heard the Father saying to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore, God, even thy God, hath anointed thee, with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." "For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,

saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." We, therefore, have seen in him the full development of a perfect manhood. God is his Father, and our Father; his God and our God. As he is the perfect representative of the Father, he is perfectly able to reveal the very God to man. He, therefore, is revealed to us as the "Lord our God." He, in truth, hath said, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

Again, we have heard the Father testifying of him, and saying, "Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest, and they shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." He, the Christ of God, is, therefore, as immortal in every shade of his being and character as is the Father himself. He is, in nature and life, as absolutely interminable and unchangeable as is God the Father, from whom he proceeded. By the power of inspiration, we have been enabled to hear him, as he stood in the presence of the Father, in all the glory of his personal identity, saying, "Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." By this same light, we have seen him, as the Father's fiduciary agent, engaged in the work of creation, and the development of man in all the beauty and power of his own image and after the perfection of his own likeness. We have, also, seen him, as he is himself developed, in the work of revealing the Father to the active and inquiring mind of man. This work demanded an agency of God's own choosing. This medium of communication must possess in his being an absolute and perfect divinity, and a perfect human nature also. He must, therefore, be in identity the God-Man, the perfect *Instaromnium*. Thus, and thus only, could the Father be revealed in him, and man be perfectly represented by him. Were he not like all, and did he not stand for all, and represent all, how could it be said by the inspiration of God, that "it pleased the Father that in him, should all

fullness dwell?" From all these considerations, we are warranted in saying that Christ is, in his being and life, as absolutely interminable as is the being and life of the Father himself. He was, therefore, in all respects, equal with the Father, and yet in him there was a perfect manhood developed. God the Father existed as a pure spirit; "he is a spirit," and, as such, he was, and is, to be revealed to man. If, however, we were left with no other than a pure spiritual medium of communication, our knowledge of God would be forever below the standard indicated by the necessities of our nature, and the designs of our existence. The relation which man sustains to God the Father, would forever have remained to him an interminable mystery. But as Divinity is an absolute spirit in being and life, and human nature is also an absolute spirit of immortal birth in being, both these spiritual identities could be, and were made to dwell together in a body of flesh, having a current of material blood for its life. We must not, however, look upon and compare the manhood of Christ with man in his present state of being. We may, nevertheless, contemplate and determine with much certainty, what man was in his fully developed state of perfect manhood, and what he might have gained for all his race, if by the obedience of that faith in God the Son, which the interest of his being and nature of life demanded, he had remained the sovereign possessor of his God-given inheritance, situation, and character. Being constituted in the image of God the Son, and made to exist after his likeness, he was, in every way, fully endowed with sufficient power and authority to exercise his own free will in all the duties which were presented to him by the necessities of his being and manner of life. The relation he sustained to God, was to man in the Garden of Eden a matter of certain knowledge. The obligations resting upon him were matters of no small interest to him. His personal standing in the sight of God, was to him a well known fact, demonstrated by the power of a well known personal experience in companionship with God. His own personal and representative duties were fully made known to him. Christ, the God-Man, the immortal *Instar-omnium*, was in the garden with him as a personal friend,

teacher, and representative of a Father's love and power. He, therefore, stood between God the Father and man, as the personal representative of the dualistic man Adam, in all the interests of his being and manner of life. In the creation and development of this great family of God the Father, the work was by the Father committed into the hands of the Son, as the fiduciary agent to whom was given all power and authority, both in heaven and upon earth. He found the protoplast of all his work existing in the mind, the will of the Father, and most fully and certainly developed in his own personal existence. We may, therefore, consider what man would have been, and what he will yet be made to enjoy, without the effects of sin upon him. We may compare man in his soul-life and being, as well as in his immortality of flesh without sin, by and with what Christ was and is now, without having been in any way subject to the corrupting power of sin. For we are fully assured that they who are, in mind and heart, prepared to see him as he really is, shall be made again to exist in his image and to wear his likeness. "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," came down through the azure bosom of the heavens, and fell upon the ears of men, when at the Jordan, John the Baptist, as the representative of the house of Israel, consecrated Christ as a king, in a stream of living water. Then, to be like him, is to be made a king and a priest unto God forever.

When did his authority as a king begin to exist? We answer, he proceeded forth and came out from God the Father, as king, with all the sovereign power of God developed in him, as such. He therefore came with all the full authority and power to establish for himself a kingdom. This he did in the creation and development of the man Adam. Here began the family or kingdom of God, in the visible compact of man's dualistic and dynamic organization and economy of life. Christ was made the head, the king, the elder brother, as well as the creator and progenitor of man. He therefore in all things had the pre-eminence. God the Father produced the Son, and sent him forth as a fiduciary agent, with life in him for the world of mankind, with power and authority to make ample provision for all the subjects of

his kingdom, for every member of his family. The God-Man produced and endowed the man Adam as the fiduciary agent under him, to transmit being and life to all the unnumbered generations of his race, in his own image, and after his likeness. This Adam was as perfectly able to do, in the exercise of that faith which works, and ever works by love, as was Christ to do the will of his Father. Had Adam been as faithful to the trust committed to him by the Son, as was the Son faithful to the trust committed to him by the Father, the relation between man and the Father would not have been in any way interrupted, nor would the God-given medium of communication have been hidden from his eyes. The companionship of man and the God-man would have been as interminable as that of God the Son with God the Father. Man's knowledge of the power and glory of God the Father, would have been forever and ever increasing, under the power of God the Son as a teacher and example. The enjoyments arising from a constantly increasing knowledge, would have been forever perfect, not in degree, but in quality. Man's ever increasing capacity for enjoyment would have been the source of the everlasting pleasure of the Father, and of the Son. In the existence of man, and in the influences arising out of social companionship with him, in all the extended and still extending generations of his race, the eternal God-head would have remained well pleased. We do not know, even now, the power there is in the mind of man, nor can we know how much would have been added to his personal powers of thought, feeling, and desire, had he not sinned. By the enlargement of the power of a perfect and personal experience strengthening him in all the stirring energies of an immortal life, man would have been able to stand without fear, or the least degree of anxious trepidation, in the life-giving presence of the eternal God-head. Thus would he have been made to feel all the immortal delights that could possibly arise in the heart and mind of an obedient child, from the developed presence of a loving Father, whose smiles of approval bid it welcome to his arms and to his heart. The pleasure of being formed in his image, and of wearing his likeness, is a well-spring of joy not to be

expressed by the power of mortal lips. Man, in an evil, degenerate state, is so far off from God, and so much enfeebled in mind and corrupted in heart, that we are even made to feel that God is an enemy to us. We are now prone to look upon God as does the man who is under the sentence of death look upon the jury who found him guilty of murder, and upon the judge who pronounced the sentence of death upon him. The real enmity is in the degenerate heart of man. God is our Father, Christ is our elder brother. God so loved us, that he sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, or any part of it, but that the world might be saved through him. Therefore man, though degenerate and perverted in all the dispositions of mind and heart, and made to be sensual in all the thoughts, feelings, and desires of his nature, by the corrupting power of sin, yet he may learn, if he will but hear, that there is an assurance given to all men, by our immortal friend and brother, the glorious Instaromnium, "that the pure in heart shall see God." He therefore stands in the way of every child of Adam's race, saying, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." We will not be able to know and to comprehend, in all the stirring energies and powers of our present earth life, what is the length and breadth, the height and depth, of the gracious assurances given to us through the agency of that glorious intermedium, who stands between God and man in his present degenerate condition. Christ alone has the power to perfectly analyze the word of God, and to give to man the meaning thereof. We have been told by him in the burning words of love, saying, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." A knowledge of God the Father can be given through no other medium, than he who alone represents all the interests of man; even by Jesus Christ the God-Man. The importance of the knowledge thus to be revealed to man, is manifested in the words of Christ, John xvii. 3: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

This knowledge, this eternal life, is in the only mediator between God and man, even the man Christ Jesus, and is by him freely offered to the world on terms that are in perfect harmony with the God-given powers of man's own mind, and the best interests of his very nature of being. "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life." Therefore, it is written, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." He, therefore, that honoreth the Son, honoreth the Father which hath sent him. The life of Christ was a dependent one; he once stood as man's representative in a state of probationary agency. The test of his perfect fidelity was made. By that faith of obedience which ever works by love, he stood, and withstood, every temptation, and was by the Father sealed. And to him was given all who should believe on his name. It is, therefore, written in Gal. ii. 16-20, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." How, then, are we to be justified in the sight of God? By our faith in Christ as the object? Nay, verily; but it is necessary for us to believe in Christ, and we are even commanded so to do, that we may be justified by the faith of Christ. Christ Jesus, the God-Man, was an active subject of faith in God the Father. It is the faith of Christ, as the *Instaromnium*, that is accounted to us who believe in Christ for righteousness. He, therefore, is of God the Father, "Made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." We cannot boast of, or glory in, our faith, but in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. This idea is fully developed in the twentieth verse of this chapter: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Therefore, we conclude that we are saved by the grace of God, through the faith of Christ. Hence we

we read in Gal. iii. 11, "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, the just shall live by faith." By whose faith do Christians live? Is it their faith in Christ Jesus that is the agency of justification and of life? We answer, No; and repeat the language of Paul, in Ephesians ii. 8, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." It is, therefore, "not of works, lest any man should boast." We have before seen that faith exercised by man is a work, and one which we are commanded to do. In order, therefore, to make this matter more plain, we will refer again to John vi. 28, 29: "Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." If there had been any other duty to be done that was an absolute necessity in order to man's salvation in Christ, then and there he would have developed the fact and stated what it was. Again, we refer to 1 John iii. 23: "And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment." Are we to believe in Christ in order to salvation by Christ? We answer, Yes. Why is this necessary? Paul has answered this question in Gal. ii. 16: "Even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ," we are found trusting in any acts of obedience which we can do of ourselves, or that can be done by another man by our consent, "we ourselves, also, are found to be sinners." Yet, we cannot say that "Christ is the minister of sin," Christ having made known the mystery of the will of the Father unto us, in perfect accordance with the good pleasure of the Father, and in keeping with his plans and purposes of love, which he proposed in himself, "That in the dispensation of the fullness of time, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him in whom we have obtained an inheritance (by faith), being predestinated according to the purpose

of him, who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." What is that purpose of God, by which we, as the children of God by faith, even by the faith of Christ, were predestinated to an inheritance among the saints? It was this: that they who should glorify God, by trusting in Christ, should be sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, as heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. See Eph. i. 13: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise;" which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance; the knowledge of which the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has purposed to communicate to us who believe, through the agency of his Holy Spirit. The faith of Christ was an immortal faith; it is a living faith of active power and energy to-day. He was, by the sovereign authority of God the Father, sealed as the author and finisher of our faith. He stands to-day as our King, and, therefore, as our representative. We are his dependent subjects. He is our Day's-man, the sinner's intercessor, the Christian's advocate, the world's Redeemer, the believer's precious Saviour. "For, God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. For, God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." The faith of Christ Jesus stands, and will ever stand, between the soul that believes and the power of condemnation, because by it he is, and shall be justified; for, "By him all that believe, are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." He stands to-day, and has ever stood, as man's faithful high priest, ever "touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." We may, therefore, ask in his name, and believing in him makes the answer to our petitions not only possible, but sure. We may, therefore, "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may

obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life." "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself;" "Even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Yes, even this Spirit, shall bear witness with your spirit, that you are born of God. This evidence gives peace and joy, such as can arise from no other source, because it is by the Spirit of God, which is freely given to all who believe, that Christians are made to know that the Son of God has taken up his abode in them. O Theanthropos, thou ever blessed God-Man! yea, even thou immortal Instaromnium!

Thy praise shall sound from shore to shore,
Till moons shall wax and wane no more.

Then, in a nobler, sweeter song,
I'll sing thy power to save.

The name given to Christ in Matt. i. 23, Emmanuel, is in exact keeping with the name spoken of in Isaiah vii. 14, as being given by the Lord himself. This name is in itself a mystery; Gabriel gives the interpretation thereof, "God with us." He was, therefore, God as well as man, and, as a man, he lived and dwelt in the flesh of a man among men.

This word God is used in the Bible to denote the Supreme, the only uncreated One. It represents the Sovereign of the universe, the Creator of all things, the Redeemer and Saviour of man. In attempting to analyze this name, so as to give some correct idea of the being and manner of existence indicated by it, we find but two words used in the English language that approximate anything like a satisfactory definition. One is good, the other is love. These words are used in the Bible, not only to express the quality, but the being and character, also, of that infinite mind or spirit who, in our language, is called God. "God is good;" "God is love;" "Love is of God, for God is love;" "There is none good but God." We are authorized to say that these words do, when thoroughly analyzed, include all perfection. In them there is not, nor can there be, the least conceivable shade of incon-

sistency. We have, in the elements of these words, all the attributes of God indicated. In the Saxon word good, we find the word God standing as one of its primary significations. We may, therefore, say that good is God, because it is like God, in that it has no degrees of comparison arising out of itself, or from the root thereof. It does not, therefore, include limitation within itself.

The word love is equally as extensive in its elements of meaning. It involves all the social qualities that can be found in the character of God or in man. It is the well-spring of all the pleasure that can be felt in the being of God, angels, or men. We are to regard God as a supremely social being. His good-will reaches out and extends to all his creatures. If we are to recognize the Bible as a proper and faithful exponent of his character, goodness and love are to be looked for as the primordial principles of his government, and the fundamental elements exhibited in all his plans, purposes, works, and ways. His laws are, therefore, all holy, just, and good; they are the laws of love; they breathe nothing that is contrary to the exercise of an absolute faith in him, as an infinitely benevolent Father, whose care for all his offspring far exceeds that of any earthly parent. We are, therefore, warranted in saying that an absolute and certain fulfillment of every shade of his will, in every department of his government, works no ill to any of his creatures. Obedience rendered to all his laws, tends only to the good of all his subjects. It is opposition, rebellion, that works ruin to any one of all the intelligent creatures of his universal empire.

Equity permeates every purpose, and regulates every design, and is manifested to man in every utterance given in that precious revelation which he has been pleased to make of himself to the world. If, then, we would be wise in his ways and works, we must allow his revealed will to be, in every respect, permeated by, and filled with, that consistency which is found to exist in goodness and love; otherwise the Scriptures could not be profitable to all mankind for doctrine, reproof, correction, and for instruction in righteousness. If we would rightly understand God's word, and be wise unto

salvation, we must in all our doctrine, and opinions of doctrine, allow God to be, with all, consistent in the revelation which he has made to man. The Scriptures are, therefore, in perfect harmony with all God's plans and purposes. We believe that all God's plans and purposes are fully made known to us in the revelation of his will, as given to us through the agency of the God-Man, Christ Jesus. We believe that there is nothing wanting in the knowledge given in the Bible. Neither is there any want of consistency or knowledge between the Father and the Son. Hence, he says (John xv. 15); "All things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you." If, then, we find any statement made in any part of the Bible, on any subject whatever, that is a matter of revelation to man, that appears to us a contradiction of some other declaration of the Scriptures, we are to look for the want of consistency in our opinions as to what the facts are in such cases. The inaccuracy is in our minds, and not in the Scriptures. If we would not be justly chargeable, in the sight of God and man, of laboring to support a church dogma at the sacrifice of consistency, or of an effort to sustain some pet idea of the fathers at the expense of truth, we will cheerfully submit all doctrines, and opinions of doctrine, to the testimony of the Bible as a whole, and to every statement contained in it, give earnest attention. If we allow God to be infinitely wise and good in all things, he is certainly so to his Son and to man; for we read of no other being so capable of holding the highest possible degree of intimacy with him. Who can be one with the Father, save the Son? and who can be one with the Son, save man in the perfection of his real manhood? This oneness with Christ did exist in the man Adam, so long as he, in loving obedience, kept his mind undividedly stayed on God. In this state of oneness he would have been confirmed, if by the act of his own free will, he had chosen to obey the loving command of God, and had eaten of the tree of life, instead of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This he could have done. The power and the liberty were given to him to eat of every tree in the garden, save the one so specifically named, of which he was forbidden to eat, having all the consequences

of an act of disobedience fully and clearly set before him. The great question is, however, as we have seen, had man in the Garden of Eden the power in himself to eat of the tree of life, and thus at once and forever have ended his probationary agency, and thus have secured an immortality of life, and oneness with God the Creator for himself and for all his posterity? We are, by the Scriptures, forced in all honesty to say that the means of life, as well as that of death, were set before him in all the sincerity of that love wherewith God loved his Son. We further believe that man had then and there the free and unrestrained liberty of choosing life, and of securing it by eating of the tree of life. We do not believe that there was anything in all the plans and purposes of God the Father concerning man, whereby he was in any way secretly influenced or openly led to distrust God, or to eat of the coveted fruit, and thus separate himself from God, who is the life of the soul. In proof of this position, we refer to Gen. ii. 9, 16, 17: "And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Here were the means of life and of death prominently before man's eyes. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat." Yes, of the tree of life, for it was there, and as easy to approach as any other tree. "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Here was love's restraint.

ART. IV.—"*Sanctification*," "*Holiness*," "*Perfect Peace*."

WE can only know what these are by an examination of the Scriptures. We cannot determine the question by what Mr. Wesley, Dr. Clarke, or any other man may say. Nor can we find it out by the "*Discipline*," or "*Confession* of

Faith" of any of our Churches, only so far as it may lead us to the "oracles of God." They, and they only, can teach us what it is to be sanctified, to be holy, and to have perfect peace. There seems to us to be a great "confusion of tongues" in regard to this Bible doctrine. There are not a few which speak of "sanctification," "perfect love," "perfect peace," "perfect holiness," "Christian perfection," and "sinless perfection," as meaning the same thing. There seems to be, among many Christians, the idea that regeneration and sanctification are not only different doctrines, but are entirely independent experiences of the Christian life; that one may be enjoyed months and even years without the other; that they are so separate and distinct that sanctification is to be sought for separately and distinctly, as a new and advanced blessing; that "perfect peace" is sanctification, and *vice versa*. We do not so understand God's word.

The literal meaning of the word sanctification is always two-fold, and only two-fold. First, it means a separation; secondly, it means a consecration, or setting apart. In the many instances in both the Old and New Testaments where the word and its derivations are used, they invariably have this two-fold meaning, separation and consecration. It never has any other meaning; never embraces more or less than these. If there be a single instance to the contrary, it is to be found in the passage when the idea is first introduced in the Bible, Gen. ii. 3: "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Here, at first glance, it would seem to have only the meaning of consecration—he consecrated the seventh day. But on a closer view, it will be found that to say God separated this day from secular work and objects, while he consecrated it to holy and heavenly work and objects, would not do any violence to the idea which seems to be conveyed, seeing that the Sabbath-day in order to be a Sabbath, must first be divorced from secular employments before it can be employed in work purely religious and heavenly.

In the many places connected with the tabernacle, and vessels of the sanctuary, the priests and their vestments, and indeed, all places where sanctify, sanctified, or sanctification is used, this same two-fold idea is kept up. We find the same

in the New Testament throughout. We come to the question then, Is sanctification, as applying to experimental personal religion, a separate and independent experience from justification and regeneration? If it be, then we will find in the Scriptures two classes of Christians—one class regenerated but not sanctified, the other both regenerated and sanctified. Do we find any such classes? Does any New Testament writer mention such a distinction among Christians? We have failed to find such passages, or else we have failed to rightly understand those found. We are aware of the learning, talent, and piety which advocate the opposite sentiment, and which we esteem all very highly, and would not, for any consideration, throw a straw in the way of any child of God in obtaining perfect peace, for it surely is attainable; nor would we do otherwise than rejoice in the advancement and “growth in grace” of the humblest of God’s children. But there may be peace that is a false peace after all. If we would have “the peace of God that passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds,” we must “study the things that make for peace.” There can be no real, permanent, “perfect peace,” but such as arises from receiving, understanding, and resting upon the truth in God’s word. That must be the foundation, and only foundation, of our faith and hope, joy and peace, or our faith is vain, our hope is vain, our joy and peace fallacious. Does Christ or his apostles anywhere speak of Christians under two classes, sanctified and unsanctified, or as regenerated and sanctified, or by any language equivalent in meaning to these? We have not found such. On the contrary, whenever the terms sanctified, sanctification, and sanctify, are used in reference to God’s people, they are used as applicable to all of them alike. The truth is that regeneration, or being born again, is sanctification begun in the man, and so far as the soul is concerned, it is sanctification complete. The Holy Spirit separates the soul and consecrates it to God, to his service, and to heaven. But the other parts of the man need cleansing or separation, and consecrating, and the work will not be complete over the entire man, until “mortal shall put on immortality, corruption, incorruption,” in the glorious resurrection morn. Then the

entire man, soul, body, and spirit, shall be re-united, separated from sin, and consecrated forever to God and glory.

We must be content with a few out of many passages which might be quoted, to show that sanctification belongs alike to every Christian, and because he is a Christian. "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly." (1 Thes. v. 23.) The following inferences are plain: First, that those for whom this prayer was offered were sanctified in part; second, that they were all in a like condition, no difference. Mind that it was their privilege, and as such he prayed for it, that they might be wholly, or all their parts sanctified. "Unto the Church of God which is in Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints," etc. (1 Cor. i. 2.) Here the entire Corinthian Church is denominated "sanctified." "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus," etc. (1 Cor. vi. 11.) Here again; all that were justified were sanctified. Indeed, we have not been able to find any passage that would not readily admit of this interpretation. Would it not be a strange anomaly in God's government, to go so far in preparing a depraved soul for heaven, to justify it, clear it of all guilt in the sight of law, and leave it without any further preparation? Is there any imaginable reason why the Holy Ghost would approve a soul, and still have that soul unseparated, unsanctified, the work hanging midway incomplete? What conditions are required in order to sanctification, that are not required in order to justification? It is said we must believe with all the heart in order to sanctification. Is anything less required in order to justification? "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) "Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith." (Rom. iii. 30.) "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith." (Gal. iii. 8.) "And by him (Jesus) all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii. 39.) "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 28.) "Knowing that a man is not justified

by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." (Gal. ii. 16.) "Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." (Gal. iii. 24.) These are fair samples of the tenor of the Scriptures on this point. But we have received the impression that those who preach this modern sanctification, teach that the soul only partly believes when it is justified, and it finally believes in full, and is sanctified. But where is the Bible for this idea? Is it anywhere taught that anything short of a hearty, sincere, whole-souled faith, will be accepted in order to justification? Is there a shadow of evidence in the divine Word, that anything short of the confidence or trust of all the heart will be accepted, in order to the sinner's pardon and acceptance with God? Surely not. Said Philip to the Eunuch: "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest" be baptized. (Acts viii. 37.) That is, this would entitle him to the claim of being a Christian. "And ye shall seek me and find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart." (Jer. xxix. 13.) There is no where any promise or intimation that God will be found of any soul, until he shall search for him with all the heart. This must have been already done by every justified and regenerated person. What more can he do in order to his sanctification? What more is required? The answer is easy and unavoidable. We then conclude that justification, regeneration, and sanctification, are all inseparable links in one chain, and that it is impossible to possess the one without the others. The moment a penitent soul lays hold on Christ by faith, that instant he can be, and is, legally and fully justified, because of the surety offered and accepted. At the same instant, and in view of the same surety laid hold of, the Holy Spirit can and does cleanse and change the nature; and thus by the conjoint influences of both justification and regeneration, he is sanctified or set apart to the service and communion of God.

We may be asked if sanctification is not a term often applied to Christians advanced in holiness. We answer, it is applied to regenerated persons at every stage in life, and af-

ter they have reached heaven. We have already seen that sanctification to the entire man is only complete when the entire man is cleansed from sin and all its consequences, which cannot be this side of the resurrection. For it is evident that the body, which is a part of man, lies in the grave under the power of death, which is a consequence of sin, until the resurrection. Then this mortal puts on immortality; corruption, incorruption. Then shall death for the first time be completely "swallowed up in victory." We may say, therefore, for the want of a better way of expressing it, that sanctification has its degrees, not of quality, but in extension or quantity. The first stage is realized in regeneration; the whole soul is renewed, changed, consecrated to God and his service. But the body in which it is to dwell on earth is still corrupt. All the appetites, passions, and senses are deranged, and although it is the weaker part, yet sometimes, aided by the world and the devil, it brings the soul into subjection, and leads the man to sin. It will be, then, a comparatively higher or more extensive range of sanctification, when at death the soul is disjoined from "this body of sin and death," and taken up to dwell with Jesus. When, although it may not be any holier in the abstract than on earth, it will be free from all temptations, allurements, and constraints of the corrupt flesh, and a depraved, sinful world. Thus, cut loose from all drawbacks to the love and service of God, this love and service must be greatly enhanced. Divorced from all affliction, suffering, and fear, its enjoyments must increase amazingly, and thus it may be said to be relieved from all temptation, trial, sorrow, and be anew consecrated or sanctified. Hence the meaning of such passages as the following: "And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified." (Acts xx. 32.) And when the body, redeemed from the power of the grave, shall be made spiritual and immortal, then it will be cleansed and set apart to God's glory and enjoyment, and the sanctification of the entire man be complete.

Let us now consider the question in regard to the term "holiness." Are the terms sanctification and holiness the

same in meaning? Sometimes they are, sometimes not. Holiness, in the abstract, means freedom from all sin or moral defect. There is no positive and absolute holiness this side of perfect conformity in nature, temper, motives, and acts with the nature, and requirements of the law of the great Jehovah. Holiness and sin are necessarily antipodes. They can have no more fellowship or affinity than light and darkness, or heat and cold. Sin cannot be where there is holiness; and holiness shuts out all the possibility of the existence of sin; that is, sin in any degree cannot be found in a holy being; nor can holiness in the abstract, be found in a sinful being. It is no more correct to speak of sinful man being holy, than of a dead man being alive. Sin and holiness cannot be found in the same being at the same time. The word, says Webster, comes from a root which signifies "entire, complete, sound, unimpaired," and he gives us its primary meaning, "free from sin and sinful affections." In this primary sense, it is evident that no human being on this earth, whether Christian or anti-Christian, is a holy being; "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. iii. 23.) "Both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin." (Verse 9.) "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (1 John i. 8.) "For there is no man that sinneth not." (1 Kings viii. 46.) The same is repeated 2 Chron. vi. 36. "What is man that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" (Job. xv. 14.) "How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?" (Job. xxv. 4.) "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" (Prov. xx. 9.) "For there is not a just man upon the earth that doeth good and sinneth not." (Ecc. vii. 20.) "In many things we offend all." (James iii. 2.) That is, "in many things we all offend," or do wrong. These are fair samples of the teachings of the divine word on this point.

The doctrine taught is, that no human being, however good, pious, or religious, is clear of sin in this world, and, from the necessities of the case cannot be, in an absolute sense, and therefore is not, and cannot be, "holy" in this sense.

The same rule will apply equally to the terms "perfection" and "perfect," applied to God's people in the Scriptures. Positive, absolute "perfection," "sinless perfection," cannot be ours while in this degraded, "vile body." And for any human being to make pretensions to the possession of such a state, is to flatly contradict the plain teachings of God's word, and bring the Christian religion into reproach. It may be asked, Are not the terms "holy" and "perfect" applied to God's people on this earth? Yes, but only in the secondary sense of the word. Webster gives this sense as "consecrated," "set apart," "purified." The seventh day was pronounced a holy day, not because there was anything in its nature more holy than the other six days, but in regard, simply, to the uses to which it was consecrated. So the tabernacle, the priests, their vestments, the vessels of the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple and all its furniture and vessels were called "holy," not because their nature was altered, but in reference to the purposes to which they were "consecrated." So, the people of God on earth are called a "holy people;" the prophets, "holy" prophets; the apostles, "holy" apostles; Jerusalem, was called the "holy" city. Paul calls the Colossian Church "elect of God, holy and beloved," (Col. iii. 12) and the Thessalonians "holy brethren." (1 Thess. v. 27.) Peter calls the mount of transfiguration the "holy mount." (2 Pet. i. 18.) All these uses of the term were not because of any extensive holiness or perfection in them, but because they were hallowed, consecrated to God and his service, set apart to a holy purpose. The reader will mark the fact also, that no inspired writer has made any distinction or classes among those to whom the term holy is applied. That is, there is nowhere recognized any part of God's Militant Church that is not "holy" precisely in the sense and to the extent that all other parts are called "holy." And the reason is obvious, they are all "holy" alike; that is, they have been "consecrated," "set apart," "dedicated" to the service of a holy God, and to the interests of a "holy" religion, in the same way, by the same agent, and on the same conditions. Every regenerated man is a "holy" man, because he has been cleansed, washed, and "consecrated" by the Holy Spirit to the

service of the most holy and righteous "Lord God Almighty."

But this term holiness has still another sense in which it is sometimes used in the Scriptures as applicable to the people of God, and which is often confounded with the one or the other of those already mentioned, namely, to be pure and unblamable before men. The first two meanings refer to God's love and its requirements; the last to the opinions of men. Peter speaks of "all holy conversation" or conduct. (2 Pet. iii. 11.) Paul exhorts "men to pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands" (1 Tim. ii. 8); that is, cleans hands, hands kept pure in the sight of our fellowmen. "That we should be holy and without blame before him in love." (Eph. i. 4.) "But that it (the Church) should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v. 27.) He tells Titus (i. 8), that a bishop must be holy; that is, above just reproach. In short, every soul born again, and who aims to govern his life by God's commands, who is controlled in his daily walk by motives of honor to God, and good-will to his fellow-men, is denominated in the New Testament a holy man. Every man who, in the strength of grace divine, strives against sin, and strives for a greater nearness to God, may be properly said to be "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." He is also "going on to perfection." "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

One thought more remains to be observed. What relation does all this have to what is called "perfect peace?" and is such peace attainable? We answer, yes; "the peace of God that passeth all understanding," is the privilege of every Christian to possess. But let us understand first, what the apostle means, and then we will see how this peace is attained.

First, does he mean that we can and should arrive at a state of mind where nothing will give us pain, anxiety, or apprehension? We think not. We are to feel deeply interested for our fellow-men: for the cause Christ. We are to "rejoice with them who do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." We are to "bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." Nor can it mean that Christians will not

be subject to pains and bodily diseases like others. Nor is there a promise that they shall be exempt from temptation or the buffetings of Satan. Christ, our great example, was sorely tempted. Paul had "a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan," which was not withdrawn, although he "besought the Lord thrice" to take it away. Nor are we to be exempt from either persecution, or the smart that persecution brings to all sensitive minds. Paul, who wrote of this "peace," was himself the constant subject of all kinds of "perils." Threatening dangers were all around him, besetting him behind and before; not the least of these perils were those originating from "false brethren." We are not, then, to expect a peace exempting us from all trouble, pain, anxiety, affliction, temptation. Very far from it. Indeed, the term "perfect peace," is only to be found once in the entire sacred volume. (Isaiah xxvi. 3.) No New Testament writer uses the term. And yet one plain passage is enough, if we are sure we get the proper meaning. "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee: because he trusteth in thee." No doubt, Paul means the same thing in saying, "The peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Is this a peace differing in kind, or even in degree, from that peace which the soul finds when it first trusts in Christ, and is justified and regenerated? It may be and often is different in degree, but never in kind. It is the same peace, from the same source, received in the same way, for the same reason, and to the same end. When the poor penitent sinner believes with all his heart on Jesus, then is he accepted or justified, and, "being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. v. 1.) The moment the soul rests on Christ by faith, it finds this peace. It is "the peace of God," too, "which passeth all understanding." It is "perfect peace," also, for nothing imperfect or defective can come from a perfect God.

There seems to us, then, two very great and dangerous errors which some are liable to fall into, from the manner in which this subject is handled in our days. One is that there is a peace to be obtained of a different and more exalted

quality after regeneration, than at regeneration. The other follows from the first, and is, that this peace, peculiar to sanctification, must be sought for specially and specifically in order to obtain it, and that many good Christians live long and die without ever receiving it. To the mind of the writer, these are great and dangerous errors—errors which find no shadow of sanction in God's word.

The only passage where this phrase, "perfect peace," is used, is the one quoted from Isaiah, where it is plain that it is the result of faith in God, nothing more or less. Why does the mind have "perfect peace?" The answer is, "because he trusteth in thee." Now, does not the soul find "peace with God" when it is "justified?" (Rom. v. 1.) And is not this peace received "by faith?" Is it not, then, the same peace, from the same source, and to the same extent "perfect?" The answer in the affirmative is inevitable. No soul can be justified and regenerated until it trusts in God, and that fully. What more can this soul do at any future period in life? It can only trust in God. It did that in justification. What more can it do at a future period? Remember, also, this "perfect peace" is not the result of more prayer, more work, more penitence, more stern and vigorous rules of life, but simply the result of faith in God.

The reason is plain: faith is the only hand that reaches out and takes hold of Christ and his righteousness, and makes them ours. Prayer, without faith, cannot do it, neither any amount of religious service, alms-doing, penance, or what the world calls "holy living." It is the result of "trusting in God," and this only. The best works of the best men on earth can bring no peace, for they have no merit, can have none. We can only have peace in Christ. Faith is the only door which opens to Christ, introduces us to him and makes his merit ours. Every soul when it first feels God's pardoning love, feels "perfect peace;" just as perfect as it will ever feel it, or can feel it. Remember, its joy may increase, but its peace is already perfect, and can never be more so.

We may be asked, Why then do Christians have doubts, pass dark places, give way to temptation, and seem to lose that peace of God? Answer: because their faith has wavered

or failed. True, there may be many causes lying partly or entirely within themselves for their faith faltering or failing; they neglect duty and lose their joy, and then their faith goes down also. Or they suffer skeptical ideas to obtrude themselves into the mind, and let their measure of understanding govern their measure of faith. But, be the cause what it may, when faith falters or fails, the "peace" falters and fails as well. Hence, when the apostle is describing the Christian armor, he says, "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." (Eph. vi. 16.) Remember, too, it is only he "whose mind is stayed on God," that hath the "perfect peace;" or to put the two members of the verse together, where they belong, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind (trusting in thee), is stayed on thee." The way, then, to "perfect peace" is perfect faith. Every Christian mind that has it not may have it simply by trusting in God, as when he first came to him in the hour of conversion. The great prayer of the Church to-day should be, "Lord, increase our faith." But we should pray this prayer only in the spirit of the father of the child possessed of the dumb devil (Mark ix. 24.), who "cried out and said with tears, Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief." That is, we must try to believe, desire to believe, lament that we do not believe, cultivate what faith we have. "Perfect peace," then, follows "perfect faith," as certainly as cause and effect, premise and conclusion, follow each other. From the foregoing, it is clear that this "perfect peace" does not mean "perfect love," nor "holiness," nor "sanctification." One may be "sanctified," and in a scriptural sense "holy;" may have the "perfect love" of God in his heart—for there is no other kind of love of God—and still be destitute of "perfect peace," because his faith has wavered or has become weak. Perfect peace comes only to him whose "heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord." (Psalms cxii. 7.)

To sum up, briefly: "Sanctification" is what all regenerated persons do possess, one equally with another, so far as concerns the ordinary meaning of the term in the Scriptures. "Holiness," in the abstract, no one possesses or can possess

in this life, but relative holiness all regenerated persons do possess. They are consecrated, set apart to the service of God. "Perfect love" all possess who have "the love of God shed abroad in their hearts" at all. Some are more under its power than others, but the quality of the love in each soul must be the same. "Perfect peace" all believers have so far and so long as they do believe.

The peace of the new-born soul at conversion is always perfect, full, complete, because the faith was entire, full, complete. But very few, if any, retain that complete measure of peace long, because, and only because they do not retain the same measure of faith long. As faith, from any cause, grows weaker, so decreases that peace. And the way, and only way, to renew it is to renew our faith, and when we can say with the Psalmist, "O God, my heart is fixed," then will our peace be permanent also. That is, we will be able to feel at all times an abiding assurance of acceptance with God through Jesus Christ, and of all needful grace and blessing for all earth's duties, trials, and responsibilities. To every desponding, faithless, doubting child of God, the Master says, "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you." "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." (John xiv. 27.) May both writer and readers evermore have this peace—

The peace which God alone reveals,
And by his word of grace imparts,
Which only the believer feels,
Direct and keep and cheer our hearts.

ART. V.—*Preachers and Preaching.*

A COLLECTION of sermons nearly three hundred years old, preserved in England, shows that the long-winded Puritan preachers of that period in some instances used the same text as often as twenty times before the same congregation. And

a chaplain of Cromwell's army is said to have preached eight hours upon the word "pomegranate," taken from the description of the priestly robes of Israel, and did not then conclude his "remarks" upon the points that single-word-text suggested. Other instances are mentioned of sermons the delivery of which consumed an almost equal number of hours. In the early days of the Church in this country the preaching of very long sermons was a feature especially of the Sunday exercises, while the accompanying services were so drawn out as to cover about the whole of the day. They made Sunday literally a day of worship, and not a day for rest as well as worship, so that the people had to go to their ordinary avocations Monday morning but little refreshed from the previous week's labors. And in those days it was not a matter of choice whether a person should attend church or not on Sunday. It was made compulsory upon all in health and strength to be present, and to continue there during the services. A writer for *Appletons' Journal*, who has been rummaging among the musty records of the General Court (Legislature) of the Colony of Massachusetts, finds the following singular enactment by that body in the year 1676:

"Ordered, that hereafter no pew shall be built with a door in the street, and if the builder of the pew leave the house before the close of the exercises, the pew shall revert to the church."

It appears that these private doors were cut in the sides of the meeting-house that the owners of pews might occasionally escape through them for an hour or two from the long services inflicted upon them; hence this law. Some years before a law was enacted whereby "all Christian people are forbidden to have lectures (preaching) during the week before one o'clock, it being prejudicial to the public good to lose a whole day," thus showing that the General Court looked after the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of the citizens of the Colony. "There were so many lectures now in the country," writes Mr. Winthrop in his journal, "and many poor persons would usually resort to two or three in a week, to the great neglect of their affairs and the damage of the public. The assemblies were also held till night, and

sometimes within the night, so as such as dwelt far off could not get home in due season, and many weak bodies could not endure so long in the extremity of heat or cold, without great trouble and hazard of their health. Whereupon the General Court ordered, that the elders should be desired to give a meeting to the magistrates and deputies to consider about the length and frequency of church assemblies. This was taken in ill part by most of the elders and other of the churches—they alleging that liberty for the ordinances was the main end of our coming hither." In 1639, Mr. Winthrop writes: "Mr. Hooker being to preach in Cambridge, the Governor and many others went to hear him (though the Governor did very seldom go from his own congregation upon the Lord's day). He preached in the afternoon, and having gone on, with much strength of voice and intention of spirit, about a quarter of an hour, he was at a stand, and told the people that God had deprived him both of his strength and matter, etc., and so went forth, and about half an hour after, returned again and went on, to very good purpose, about two hours." This must have been quite a moderate performance, so far as its length was concerned; but, says the writer for *Appletons' Journal*, when it came to prayers and sermons stretching through a whole day, and never ceasing till the going down of the sun—relays of ministers being on hand to take up the doctrine, as one after another gave out—and when we consider still further, that all able-bodied persons were obliged to be present at public worship, under severe penalties for unnecessary absence, it is difficult to avoid having some little sympathy with those feeble folk who built their pews "with a door in the street." How the young people and children managed to live through these interminable performances, and behave with any sort of propriety, is a great marvel; especially when we remember that the services consisted of nothing but prayers and sermons, most of which must have required a well-trained theologian to comprehend. No public reading of the Scriptures was ever allowed, and for nearly a century, there was no singing to relieve the dreary monotony of the service.

Dr. Holland had in *Scribner's Monthly* some time ago, a

plain word about the greed for sermons, so prevalent in modern times, and he expresses a doubt whether there ever was a time in the history of the Christian Church when its ministers were placed in-so awkward, difficult, and unjust a position as they are to-day. "Great, expensive edifices of worship are built," he says, "for which the builders run heavily in debt. That debt can only be handled, the interest on it paid, and the principal be reduced, by filling it with a large and interested congregation. That congregation cannot be collected and held without brilliant preaching. Brilliant preaching is scarce, because, and only because, brilliant men are scarce, and scarcer still the brilliant men who have the gift of eloquence. So soon, therefore, as a man shows that he cannot attract the crowd, 'down goes his house.' He may be a scholar, a saint, a man whose example is the sweetest sermon that a human life ever uttered, a lovely friend, a faithful pastor, a wise spiritual adviser, and even a sermonizer of rare attainments and skill, but if he cannot draw a crowd by the attractive gifts of popular eloquence, he must be sacrificed to the exigencies of finance. The church must be filled, the interest on the debt must be paid, and nothing will do this but a man who will 'draw.' The whole thing is managed like a theatre. If an actor cannot draw full houses, the rent cannot be paid. So the actor is dismissed and a new one is called to take his place." The Doctor is evidently an old fogey, for he tells his readers that it was once supposed that a Christian had something to do, even as a layman, and that a pastor was a leader and director in Christian work; that there was a time when the burden of a church was not laid crushingly upon the shoulders of its minister, and when Christian men and women stood by the man who was true to his office and true to them, but we seem to have outlived it, and a thousand American churches, particularly in the great centers of population, are groaning over discomfiture in the sad results. Instead of paying their debts, they lay them upon the backs of their floundering ministers, and if they cannot lift them, they go hunting for spinal columns that will, or tongues that hold a charm for their dissipation. This is a wrong that ought to be remedied,

and it must be, if pastors and churches are to fulfill their mission.

Who is primarily to be blamed for this condition of things, Dr. Holland does not pretend to know, but suspects that the ministers themselves ought to bear a portion of it. He contends that the sermon in America has always been made too much of. The great preachers by going into their pulpits Sunday after Sunday with their supreme intellectual efforts, have created the demand for such efforts. Metaphysics, didactics, apologetics, arrayed in robes of rhetoric, says the Doctor, have held high converse with them. The great theological wrestlers have made the pulpit their arena of conflict. Homilies have grown into sermons and sermons into orations. Preachers have set aside the teacher's simple task for that of the orator. Dr. Holland makes a strong point against the practice that has obtained in these latter days, when he says that with a knowledge of the human mind which cannot but make them aware that no more than a single sermon can be digested by a congregation in a day, and that every added word goes to the glut of intellect and feeling, and the confusion of impressions, the preachers still go on preaching twice and thrice on Sundays from the same pulpit, and seem more averse than any others to a change of policy. It is all intellectual gormandizing, and no activity, and no rest and reflection. It is all cram and no conflict, no digestion of the grand truths which it is the duty of the preachers to discuss and elucidate for the instruction of their hearers. However strong and sound the sermon may be in the great truths of the Christian religion, in

Thoughts that breathe and words that burn,

and of the duties that men and women owe to themselves, to their neighbors, to the Church, and to God, it will pass for almost nothing, if it be not clothed in eloquent language and imagery that flow as evenly and irresistibly as the current of a mighty river. It is the "moving eloquence," not plain, homely truths in plain, homely language, that stirs and pleases the congregation, and when its effect passes away—for it leaves no lasting impression on a very large portion of the audience—the work has to be gone over again and again,

and thus is accounted for the complaint so often heard of the poverty of the results of what is called brilliant preaching. There is too much cramming for even a brilliant preacher to accomplish the good that might otherwise flow from his labors. The brilliant preachers are drawn to the great cities, where the wealthy few are able to pay them the high salaries they command, but they do not find there, in the churches to which they are called, the material out of which to build up churches with large memberships. For instance, it was stated a few months ago that there were in the city of New York about four hundred and seventy places of worship of every sort and name, three hundred and eighty of which were Protestant. It is also stated by one of the New York journals that the churches in that city are but poorly filled on Sundays. A few eminent preachers—and the number is stated at not more than ten—have crowded houses, while the remainder preach to an average of two hundred to three hundred hearers. The highest estimate of those who attend the churches of that city on Sundays is ten per cent of the entire population, but other estimates place the number far below that figure. The Sabbath is becoming more and more a day of recreation and amusement, especially with the laboring classes in the large cities. There are more visitors to Central Park (New York) on Sunday than any other day, and this remark is equally true as to the other places of resort in the city and vicinity. Lord Shaftesbury stated some years ago that not more than two per cent of the working men of London attended any place of worship. This statement excited doubt, but it was verified by wide inquiry and observation. What is true of London in this respect, will hold good as to New York and other great cities of this country. It has been demonstrated that in large cities pleasure and recreation are more earnestly sought, at all times, than spiritual culture. And this spirit crops out in the smaller as well as the larger cities, though not in so marked a ratio. It is not fine and imposing buildings, with tall spires that are kissed by the first rays of the rising sun, and with elegantly cushioned pews and other accessories of equal elegance, supplemented with brilliant preaching, that catch the classes who make large

congregations and build up large churches of zealous Christians. The want was aptly pointed out by Rev W. T. Wiley, of Pennsylvania, in the International Sunday-school Convention that met in Baltimore, in May, 1875, which is "a church-home prepared for every one who lives within the reach of a Christian community." "An example is set in the city of Brooklyn, where," he said, "at a cost of twenty dollars for an individual, accommodations are furnished for four thousand six hundred people, gathered there to hear the gospel, instead of other churches where three hundred to five hundred dollars are spent, in order to furnish seating-room for one individual. What matter does it make what the building is, so that we hear the story?" Herein we have a clue to the reason why Moody and Sankey created the excitement and accomplished the results they did in New York. Their services were held where they could induce the masses—the laboring people, and those to be found in the by-ways and lanes—to attend, and where their plain, forcible repetitions of "the story" fell upon listening ears and touched sympathetic hearts. The simple story of the Man of the Cross as told by them, was not thrown away upon the crowds that daily and nightly thronged the Hippodrome. But these people are rarely seen in the great churches, where gorgeous display, fine dressing, and brilliant preaching are the order, and hence the meager results that so often attend the efforts of the preachers in these churches. It is not the fault of the preacher or the preaching, that his efforts are not crowned with better results, but it is because the seed is sown in stony ground.

ART. VI.—*Conflicting Systems.*

SOMETIME since there appeared a work from the press of Lee and Shepard, Boston, whose full title is: *The Bible Regained, and the God of the Bible ours; or, The System of Religious Truth in Outline.* By Samuel Lee. This book is a

handsomely printed and neatly bound volume of two hundred and eighty-five pages, small 12mo. Though not large, it contains a very considerable amount of matter, arranged and comprehensively discussed, in nine chapters and an appendix, preceded by a most striking introduction of some length. The subjects of the several chapters are: "The Creation;" "The Fall;" "The Antediluvian Period;" "The Patriarchal Period;" "The Mosaic Period;" "The Messiah;" "The Kingdom of Heaven—What it Presupposes;" "The Kingdom of Heaven—What it Implies;" "Eternal Punishment—False Advocacy Corrected." In the appendix there are four sections: a. "Right and Conscience;" b. "Penalty not an Element in the Moral Government of God;" c. "1 Peter iii. 18-21;" d. "The Church and its Functions."

The attempt of the author is, as his sub-title expresses it, to give "The System of Religious Truth in Outline." The work is a curious and instructive one. It contains a marvelous admixture of fact and fancy, truth and falsehood, genuine earnestness and unconscious sham. The author emphasizes the word "system," for he says he "believes that all truth—truth relating to God and the world he has made, and man his creature, and the divine government, providential and moral—all is a great whole, every part of which is in true and philosophical correlation to each and every other part." He says further, "The doctrines of this volume are those essentially of our venerable fathers, save that in one particular there is a deeper shading of the same color, or rather a more intense glow of the same light. The grace that shows Christ to the infant in the land beyond the river—we all believe this—I suppose makes a similar revelation to all who in this world have never heard the gospel. If infants are saved by becoming holy, all the conditions for the development of moral character are to be found in that other world as in this. This is not heresy, but only 'more of the same thing.'" Proceeding, the author tells us of a leading English Congregationalist minister, who, a few years ago, delivered to his brethren of the English Congregational Union, an able address, in which he "clearly recognized the fact that the old Calvinism has ceased to be the doctrine of the Congregational churches,

and feared that in letting it go there had been too little care to supply its place with a consistent substitute." On this our author says: "To furnish this 'consistent substitute,' is the object of this volume."

Having thus allowed our author to present to the reader his object, we shall briefly endeavor to give the manner in which he proposes to accomplish his object, under the divisions before noticed. The following short paragraph may be regarded as the key-note of the entire "system": "Christianity is in a state of transition. The past cannot go into the future. Authority in religious belief and practice is coming to an end. The reign of common sense and of intuitional convictions is at hand." "But," he admits, "the state of man is abnormal. Abnormal functions are implied in and follow in the train of sin. . . . As an effect of the fall, moral darkness has come over the mind. The report of our intuitions is, therefore, to be taken with allowance. Still the primal elements are there." Here is an emphatic passage: "During the four or five centuries that immediately preceded the advent of the Messiah—the period in which the human mind, unaided by revelation, made its highest attainments—the philosophers of Greece and Rome occupied positions of sublimity, and expressed opinions of the character of Deity, that should shame some of our modern theologians. I would sooner choose the Deity of some of those great men for my heart's trust and love, than the God of Drs. Shedd, or Hovey, or Hickok."

Speaking of the revelation of God and its divine authority, the writer thinks that men have perverted it, and that while learned men have produced monstrous systems of philosophical theology out of it, the body of believers in it have blindly followed its directions, without a wish to investigate God's truth outside of it. "They depended on their religious teachers, and ignored the fact that they had a standard in the reports of their own intuitions, by which to try the correctness or otherwise of (men's) teachings. Hence dogmas and creeds became authoritative. This, at first, silent admission, was soon chrystalized into ecclesiastical law, and to depart from the creed was heresy." "The infidelity of the past cen-

tury consisted essentially in a disbelief in the creeds and teachings of the Church, and then, as if fairly represented in these creeds, in the Bible. French infidelity was and is the offspring of Catholicism. The present infidelity in Germany, England, and our own country, grows from the soil of Protestant dogmas." We wish the reader to note well this last passage, for a thoughtful comparison with a conflicting view which will be presented.

The directly theological views of our author receive color and cast throughout, from the following positive principle of his faith: "An error more fundamental than perhaps any other, is in the assumption that *penalty* is an element in moral government." In the necessary course of his reasonings upon the whole field of theological opinion, this "fundamental" principle leads him to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, the general future judgment of men, the infinite guilt of sin, the atonement for the guilt of sin, and cognate teachings of orthodoxy. His soul seems harrowed up with horror at the peculiar theological views of Jonathan Edwards and the whole body of thorough Calvinists. After summing up the "method," which "the skill of the metaphysicians has invented," he exclaims, "And this is called the gospel of Christ! This assumes to call itself 'Orthodoxy.' 'O, my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united.'"

Our author gives the two following principles as a summary of his views: "First, an ethics whose principles are simple and defined. God is love. Love's correlate is the happiness of others, and this—the happiness of others and all others—is the object of the divine administration." "Secondly, that the moral government of God is simply and purely moral, and that, consequently, its sole appeal is to the moral functions; *i. e.*, *penalty*, as appealing simply to fear, is not and cannot be an element of the moral administration of God." On these principles he believes that he has been "carried through the entire system of revealed truth," and opened it to others.

Now, after the preceding, will not the reader be surprised that our author should say: "This world is Christ's. The

history of its creation, and of the divine government over it, is a history of the development of Christ, the eternal Logos. . . . All things were made by him, and with reference to him, and of course adapted to his purpose." But how strange it is that the writer of our book should regard "the history of the fall of our first parents" as an allegory, and also that of the temptation of Christ in the wilderness! He is evidently unsound upon the doctrine of the fall, yet he squarely states that the race is a race of sinners, and must be brought to repentance and faith. He positively asserts the depravity of man. On the "Messiah," the writer has many strong and correct views, yet he must be narrowly watched throughout.

One grand incidental fact, which is noticeable all through this work is, the protest it makes against "orthodoxy," as represented by the necessitarians of the Edwards school of theology, and of all rigid Calvinists. The severity of doctrine which has ever characterized that body of theologians, has often led them to severity of judgment upon the theology of other orthodox Christian men, and for that reason it is not surprising that there should be severe rejoinders from theologians of all schools. We are not surprised, from our knowledge of man's mental constitution, at the following statement of the author of the book before us: "It is a fact full of hope, that there is in those who lead the van of the 'sacramental host' the belief that neither creeds nor anathemas are of any avail in preserving purity of doctrine in the Church. The facts of history are decisive on this point. They who have made the freest use of creeds to fence out error, have suffered most from its inroads."

All that is clearly unorthodox in the passages which we have quoted, we hereby distinctly repudiate as of the word of God, and we also as distinctly announce our belief in the usefulness of creeds, as the expression in brief of the faith of Christian denominations, when held in due subordination to the Bible, which is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The time is scarcely yet past, when Cumberland Presbyterians, with all their well-known zeal for the evangelical faith of the gospel, were the objects of severe criticism

by their brethren of the Presbyterian Church, not for their usages merely, but for their doctrinal belief. Why, during that glorious centennial year just closed, an era above all others for good feeling, and the recognition of all good men, one of the most learned of Presbyterian divines, in a historical discussion which has been published in a volume of centennial discourses, speaks of the position of Cumberland Presbyterians, in their separation from the Presbyterian Church, as "defiant." "Defiant" of what? Why, of the authority of a Synodical Commission, of the Synod, and of the General Assembly, of course. Free men, in this free country, exercising their rights of private judgment and unrestrained liberty of action, under the Constitution of the United States, called "defiant," because they did not choose to submit to what they sincerely believed to be ecclesiastical oppression!

In the light of the foregoing, our readers will be interested in the following lengthy extract which we take from one of the leading religious journals of the Presbyterian Church, and which appeared about the same time as, or just after, the issuance of the volume we have been noticing so particularly. Is it not singular that the same scriptural apostrophe is used by the writer of the "Bible Regained" and by that of the article here presented? Let the reader note this point carefully as a matter of interest in calmly surveying the conflict of systems of religious faith drawn honestly from the same great source of truth. Under the caption "Hold the Fort," the writer says:

HOLD THE FORT! Chrysostom, in his homilies upon the Sermon on the Mount, has this remark anent the familiar passage, "Ye are the salt of the earth:" "What then?" asks the homilist. "Did they (the apostles) restore the decayed? By no means; for neither is it possible to do any good to that which is already spoilt by sprinkling it with salt. This, therefore, they did not. But rather what things had been before restored, and committed to their charge, and freed from that ill savor, these they then salted, maintaining and preserving them in that freshness which they had received of the Lord. For that men should be set free from the rottenness of their sins was the good work of Christ. But their not returning to it again any more was the object of these men's diligence and travail."

There is a truth embalmed in these words of the good father of the "golden mouth" that should have deep lodgment in the bosom of every Christian. The teachers and professors of our holy religion, who are the salt of the earth, need to use their preservative powers upon the Church itself. Or to take up the imagery suggested by our caption, the Church

should turn her thoughts upon the importance of conserving her own conquests. The army of Christ has indeed advanced, conquering and to conquer. Line after line of the enemy's works has fallen. Time and again the very citadel has been seized and occupied. But it has not been held. The standard of truth has been lowered. The doctrines of grace have been perverted or abandoned. The faithful testimonies of the fathers have turned to idle mummeries or creedless speculations upon the lips of succeeding teachers. That has followed which might have been expected. With the decay of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity the life of Christianity has decayed.

Where are the churches founded by the apostles and primitive Christians—the churches of Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, and Northern Africa? Rome was won for Christ. But the doctrines of the Evangel were expressed from the faith of Roman Christians by the in-crowding of the commandments of men; and, alas! Romanism is but an imperfect representative of Christianity. If we glance over the lands of the Reformation, the same discouraging fact faces us. The fort was won for Christ at Geneva by Farel, Olivetan, and Calvin. The ramparts of doctrinal defense were neglected, and suffered to fall into decay. Rationalism pushed in her forces, and her banner of Doubt floats out to-day boldly and free, side by side with the banner of the Cross. So with the country of William the Silent—noble little Holland. So with the land of Luther. So also with the Presbyterianism that once held England. So in a considerable degree with the land of our own Puritan ancestors.

In every case the decay of vital religion has been preceded by a declension from the distinctive doctrines of Scripture. The citadel of faith has never fallen until the keepers of the fort have laid aside the weapons of doctrinal truth. That is the lesson for us to consider. If we would hold the conquests of Christianity, we must maintain the traditions of the saints; must preach the word in its simplicity and fullness.

There has prevailed for the greater part of a generation a style of preaching, and writing, and thinking which has eschewed these facts and their lesson. Nothing could be more unfortunate. Nothing could be more unwise than the flippant manner in which pulpit orators, great and small, have brushed away from them, and from their ministrations, the solid foundation doctrines of our several denominational creeds and symbols. The work of such men is not that of a wise master-builder, but of iconoclasts. The echoes of their ministry are heard, or shall be heard, in the popular cry, "Raze it! raze it!" They are destructives. They are beating down the ramparts of the fort that our fathers won for God and truth. They are making breaches in the walls of Zion—not in the strongholds of sin. Their pulpits are as seats of the scornful. They are betraying and spoiling the work and fruits of the toils, sufferings, and blood of the saints. We believe this, and we charge it. And we earnestly call upon our ministers to say, "O, my soul, come not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united!"

We will not close this article without recording the pleasing fact, that we have discerned the rising of a strong reactionary feeling against this false and traitorous ministry. We can observe it in some of those lands which have been referred to. The error has been seen, and although great damage has been wrought, it is not too late to reconquer the strongholds. We think that in our own country, where less than elsewhere the evil has prevailed, the same reaction may be observed. May its power and extent grow until the watchmen of Zion shall everywhere go round about her walls, and be able to tell of restored and strengthened bulwarks of doctrinal simplicity and truth! We put our pioneers to the front, to win new conquests for the Divine Master. Let us hold the forts already taken by faithfulness to the testimonies of God. "Hold that fast that thou hast, that no man take thy crown."

There is much truth in this passage, and we endorse it heartily, but what would be the result should we respectfully ask of the learned editor, who wrote it, for a full and candid statement of "the doctrines of grace" which, he says, have "been perverted or abandoned?" What "faithful testimonies of the fathers" does he allude to? What are "the distinctive doctrines of Christianity" which have "decayed" in the hands of many of the sons? Shall we be unjust in answering for him in one significant sentence of his own, "The fort was won for Christ at Geneva by Farel, Olivetan, and Calvin"? Does this allude strictly to the Reformation? Then what ought he to have said of Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, and others of the great warriors in that fearful battle? Why has "Rationalism pushed in her forces," and why does the "banner of Doubt float out to-day boldly and free, side by side with the banner of the Cross"? Is an answer not found in the things presented in the book above noticed? Is that answer not seen in the religious history of each of the lands mentioned in our extract; seen in Geneva, Holland, Germany, England, and New England of to-day? The human mind when intelligent and free is influenced by the powerful forces of reactionary opinion and faith. Augustine, Calvin, the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Assembly, and the many erudite doctors after them, who specially represent the theology comprehensively set forth in the celebrated "five points," are greatly responsible for the floating of the banner of "Doubt" and the pushing in of the forces of "Rationalism" upon the field of Christian faith. From the rigidity of stern and high doctrines, formulated by metaphysical and astute minds, a mighty current of reaction has borne many thinking men to the other extreme of doubt, rationalism, and even nihilism. The only safety for the human spirit, and the only safeguard of theological faith, is clinging closely to the simple word of "the gospel of the grace of God."

THE
PUBLISHER'S ANNOUNCEMENT.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM

is published quarterly. It is designed to be an exponent of the Theology and Polity of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and a means of conveying to both ministers and people that information which can reach them by no other publication of the Church.

TERMS.

Single subscription, \$2 per annum. A copy *gratis* to the one sending a club of THREE.

THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN,

Published weekly (including postage)..... \$2 15

For a club of five, a copy of Sunday Morning as a premium.

For a club of ten, a copy of the Theological Medium or Cumberland Presbyterian as a premium.

For a club of twenty, a copy of Sunday Morning, Theological Medium, and Cumberland Presbyterian as a premium.

THE SABBATH SCHOOL GEM

Is published semi-monthly, on the following terms per annum:

Single copy (including postage)..... 50 cents.

In clubs of from five to fifteen to one address..... 40 "

In clubs of twenty or more to one address..... 30 "

SUNDAY MORNING

Is published monthly, on the following terms:

Single copy, one year..... 60 cents.

To one address, five to ten copies, one year, each..... 50 "

To one address, fifteen copies and upward, one year,
each..... 40 "

The Theological Medium, Cumberland Presbyterian, Sabbath School Gem, and Sunday Morning, all for \$5 00.

How to Remit Money.

Send by Check, Post-office Order, Draft, or Express. Unless so sent, the remittance will be at the sender's risk.

Address,

T. C. BLAKE, D.D., Pub. Agent,
NASHVILLE, TENN.

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

THE THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM is published Quarterly, in January, April, July, and October.

It will be printed in the best style, on good paper, each number containing 128 pages, large octavo. Price per single copy, *in advance*, Two Dollars per Volume. A copy *gratis* to the one sending a club of THREE.

Ministers and others who feel an interest in the circulation of the MEDIUM, are earnestly solicited to act as agents.

Subscribers changing their Post-office address are requested to give notice of the same to the Publishing Agent.

No subscription will be taken for a less time than One Year, and the back numbers of the Volume will, in all cases, be sent whenever it is practicable to do so.

The four numbers of the MEDIUM, during the year, will make a book of 512 pages, and subscribers ought, by all means, to preserve them, and have them bound. For this purpose the edges are left uncut.

The Postage on the MEDIUM is Three Cents a number—Twelve Cents a year, prepaid.

Persons who wish to procure any of the works that we review would do well to address T. C. BLAKE, D.D., the Publishing Agent of our Board.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for all the views of his correspondents. No writer, however, will be permitted to express sentiments subversive of any of the fundamental doctrines of the sacred Scriptures. Free discussion will be tolerated in the pages of the MEDIUM, provided that a dignified, Christian spirit is maintained.